DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 297 672 HE 021 649

AUTHOR Newman, James F.
TITLE An Examination of the Perceptions of Academic Freedom of Dowling College Faculty Members and Administrators in General. The Emergence of Higher Education in America.
PUB DATE Jun 86
NOTE 105p.; Ed.D Practicum, Nova University.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160) -- Dissertations/Theses - Practicum Papers (043)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Freedom; Administrative Policy; *Administrator Attitudes; *Educational Environment; Educational Philosophy; *Faculty College Relationship; Governance; Higher Education; Intellectual Freedom; Questionnaires; Student Rights; Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Rights; Teacher Role; Tenure
IDENTIFIERS *Dowling College NY

ABSTRACT

A questionnaire survey was conducted to examine academic freedom as perceived by faculty members at Dowling College (New York) and by administrators in general. Topics covered in this study include: elements of academic freedom, the faculty and academic freedom, relationship of the Board of Trustees to the faculty, relationship of the administration to the faculty, election of officers, standard setting, appointment procedures, tenure, relationship of faculty members with colleagues, relationship of faculty members with students, extramural activities, external pressures, governance, right to strike, and other areas. Recommendations include the following: establishing a Joint Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities; establishing a committee of Board members, administrators, and faculty to examine the relationship of the board and administration to the faculty; reaching an agreement about the responsibility for directing the college's educational policies; reaching an agreement regarding the responsibility for faculty status; discussing the granting or non-granting of tenure; re-examining and clarifying institutional governance procedures; avoiding strikes at all costs; and recognizing and defending the academic freedom of students. An appendix provides the academic freedom questionnaire. Contains 55 references. Tables are included. (SM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED297672

AN EXAMINATION OF THE PERCEPTIONS OF ACADEMIC FREEDOM OF DOWLING COLLEGE FACULTY MEMBERS AND ADMINISTRATORS IN GENERAL

THE EMERGENCE OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN AMERICA

by

James F. Newman, M.B.A.

Dowling College

DR. PHYLLIS COOPER

PHILADELPHIA CLUSTER

A PRACTICUM PRESENTED TO NOVA UNIVERSITY IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

NOVA UNIVERSITY

JUNE, 1986

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

JAMES F. NEWMAN

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

HE 021 649

ABSTRACT

AN EXAMINATION OF THE PERCEPTIONS OF ACADEMIC FREEDOM
OF DOWLING COLLEGE FACULTY MEMBERS
AND ADMINISTRATORS IN GENERAL

James F. Newman, M.B.A.

The purpose of this practicum was to examine academic freedom as perceived by faculty members of Dowling College and administrators in general.

The meaning of academic freedom has changed over time and from country to country. Conflicts in the exercise of academic freedom arise frequently with no simple rules or general principles to resolve such conflicts. No general agreement as to what constitutes this freedom seems to exist. Faculty members perceive it differently than do administrators thus creating problems and conflict in institutions of higher learning.

Through the use of a questionnaire, various questions and statements were responded to and common and different viewpoints were identified. The results were tabulated with mean scores calculated and then exhibited in tables. Both faculty and administrators were forthright in responding and their responses provided the data needed to make recommendations for the future.

The major recommendations made were:

1. A Joint Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilites should be established.

2. The above committee should determine what comprises academic freedom at Dowling College.

3. A committee should be established to examine the interrelationships between the board, the administration and the faculty. Closer working relationships should be established and maintained.

4. Guidelines for the direction of educational policy should be established.

5. Personnel policies should be reviewed.

6. Tenure issues and policies should be reviewed.

7. Governance issues should be reviewed.

8. Faculty should support the academic freedom of peers.

9. Objective analyses of courses taught should be presented to students. Facts and views should be differentiated.

10. Strikes should be avoided at all costs.

11. All must be made aware of what constitutes academic freedom and what infringes upon it.

12. A spirit of compromise and open-mindedness must be developed for the upcoming negotiations.

13. Faculty should recognize and defend the academic freedom of students.

14. Guidelines for student publications and their content should be established.

15. Improve lines of communication between the faculty and the board and administration.

Academic freedom is the breath of life of academia. This freedom must be protected just as the freedom of speech, publication, religion and assembly (each of which is a component of intellectual freedom) must be. All concerned must safeguard this wonderful and powerful freedom lest it be lost.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	vii
INTRODUCTION	1
Background and Significance	4
PROCEDURES	7
Distribution	8
Follow-up	8
Tabulation	9
Limitations	10
RESULTS	10
Respondents	11
Scoring	12
Elements of Academic Freedom	13
The Faculty and Academic Freedom	15
Relationship of the Board of Trustees to the Faculty	17
Relationship of the Administration to the Faculty	21
Election of Officers	23
Standard Setting	24
Appointment Procedures	26
Tenure	28
Relationship of Faculty Members With Colleagues	29
Relationship of Faculty Members With Students	31
Extramural Activities	33

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

External Pressures 35

Governance 37

Right to Strike 39

Other Areas 40

DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 41

Discussion 41

Elements of Academic Freedom 41

The Faculty and Academic Freedom 43

Relationship of the Board of Trustees to the Faculty 45

Relationship of the Administration to the Faculty 51

Election of Officers 53

Standard Setting 55

Appointment Procedures 57

Tenure 59

Relationship of Faculty Members With Colleagues 60

Relationship of Faculty Members With Students 63

Extramural Activities 64

External Pressures 68

Governance 70

Right to Strike 72

Other Areas 74

Implications 77

Recommendations 81

TABLE OF CONTENTS (cont.)

REFERENCES 86

BIBLIOGRAPHY 88

APPENDIX

A. QUESTIONNAIRE ON ACADEMIC FREEDOM 91

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Elements of Academic Freedom	14
2.	The Faculty and Academic Freedom	16
3.	Relationship of the Board of Trustees to the Faculty	19
4.	Relationship of the Administration to the Faculty	22
5.	Election of Officers	24
6.	Standard Setting	25
7.	Appointment Procedures	27
8.	Tenure	29
9.	Relationship of Faculty Members With Colleagues	30
10.	Relationship of Faculty Members With Students	32
11.	Extramural Activities	34
12.	External Pressures	36
13.	Governance	38
14.	Right to Strike	39
15.	Other Areas	41

INTRODUCTION

Dowling College was founded in 1959 as the first college in Suffolk County, Long Island as a branch of Adelphi University. The founders thought of themselves as educational missionaries bringing the light of learning to the benighted inhabitants. They set about creating a college where innovation and experimentation would be the rule rather than the exception. Education was very much "free form" in the words of one survivor (Middle States, 1983:i-ii).

Administrators were few. Faculty, in consequence, exercised a comprehensive and all but unchallenged authority extending into virtually all aspects of college life. It was the faculty's conviction that the affairs of the college were not to be entrusted to administrators or trustees but must be the province of the faculty themselves. That belief was deeply planted and has not yet been uprooted. Animosity toward the Administration and mistrust of the Board of Trustees still exists (Middle States, 1983:ii).

Deliberations have been "frustrated by those willing to thwart the processes of a democratic community for their own ends." Dowling's problems have not been with the governance arrangements but rather with the political culture that has developed. There has been a suspicion with which some faculty "regard anyone who

attempts to exercise leadership, even their own elected representatives." There has been an anti-authority tradition at Dowling. Dowling's faculty was the first independent college faculty in New York State to unionize. The union "intentionally or unintentionally sometimes assumed a voice in determining educational policy" (Middle States, 1983:141-142). The governance mechanism at Dowling College has been described as a "stalemate machine" and this has added to the overall problems at Dowling College (Middle States, 1983:144).

There has been general disagreement as to what constitutes academic freedom and/or what may impinge on this academic freedom. The purpose of this practicum was to ascertain the perceptions of the Dowling College faculty and the perceptions of administrators in general of this historic and respected freedom. This is a freedom that has emerged over hundreds of years and therefore is an appropriate subject for the seminar, Emergence of Higher Education in America, conducted by Nova University.

When the Educational Testing Service Institutional Functioning Inventory was taken, faculty members' mean score in the area of freedom was 9.2 with a standard deviation of 2.5. This in percentiles is 48.6. The administrators at Dowling, on the other hand, had a mean score of 9.9 with a standard deviation of 1.9. In percentiles, this is 64.8 on the IFI Scale (Middle States, 1983:Appendix D). This inventory is for institutional

self-study purposes. In it, one is asked for perceptions about what the institution is like - administrative policies, teaching practices, types of programs, characteristic attitudes of groups of people, and so forth. This inventory is not a test; the only right answers are those that reflect perceptions, judgments, and opinions. Results are summarized only for groups (Middle States, 1983:Appendix D).

On a Governance Questionnaire sent out to faculty members and administrators, five questions were asked. When questioned about overall governance effectiveness, faculty members, on a scale of one to five from poor to excellent, had a mean score of 2.04 while the mean score of the administrators was 3.10. On the question of size and complexity of the governance structure being appropriate to Dowling College's size, the mean score of the faculty was 2.33 as compared to th core of the administrators of 3.20. The governing units' effective leadership showed a mean of 2.09 for the faculty while it was 3.20 for the administrators. When questioned about cooperation among the governing units, the faculty mean score was 1.65 and that of the administrators was 2.90. The last question dealt with institutional morale. When questioned if it was good, the faculty mean score was 1.26 compared to the administrators' score of 2.40. Overall averages were determined and the faculty mean was 1.87 whereas the administrators' mean was 2.96. There were

twenty-three faculty respondents and eleven administrator respondents (Middle States, 1983:Appendix E). Dowling College has had a history of conflict between the faculty and administration which still exists. This conflict has been in the key areas of governance and academic freedom. There has been disagreement regarding academic freedom and what comprises this most important freedom at Dowling College.

Background and Significance

The term "academic freedom" has changed over time and from country to country (Machlup, 1971:6). The concept of academic freedom, which is dominant in colleges and universities in the United States today, rests mainly on three foundations:

> 1. the philosophy of intellectual freedom, which originated in Greece, arose again in Europe, especially under the impact of the Renaissance, and came to maturity in the Age of Reason;
>
> 2. the idea of autonomy for communities of scholars, which arose in the universities of Europe; and
>
> 3. the freedoms guaranteed by the Bill of Rights of the federal constitution as elaborated by the courts (Fuchs, 1964:1).

Academic freedom is that freedom of members of the academic community, assembled in colleges and universities, which underlies the effective performanance of their functions of teaching, learning, practice of the arts, and research. The right to academic freedom is recognized in order to enable faculty members and students

to carry on their roles (Fuchs, 1961:1). Individual academic freedom means absence of restraints, penalties, and intimidation regarding man's traditional pursuits, particularly regarding his studies and inquiries, the oral presentation of his views and the publication of his findings and opinions, however old-fashioned or subversive, wise or foolish. It means also, though only secondarily, absence of institutional pressures regarding his personal conduct (Machlup, 1971:6). Fuchs (1964:3) stated:

> Hence the main concern over developing and maintaining academic freedom in this country has focused upon encouragement and protection of the freedom of the faculty member.

MacIver (1955:94-95) stressed the autonomy of the faculty within an institution in matters lying within its competence as basic to academic freedom. Kirk (1953:3) stressed the inherent right of the academic community to maintain its own standards in that search for truth which is its reason for being.

Van Den Haag (1964:85) stated that freedom is not an academic privilege; it is a right constitutionally guaranteed to protect the independence of professors from trustees, colleagues, administrators, students, alumni, and public opinion. Academic freedom goes beyond the constitutional freedom guaranteed to all Americans. The question is: "How far beyond?" Each individual, each group has individual or group concepts of academic

freedom. Each looks at it through biased eyes and often, therefore, cannot agree to its true meaning. Faculty members may have one view while administrators may have a different view.

The purpose of this practicum was to examine the concepts held by faculty versus those held by administrators. The different and common viewpoints of each group were examined. While there had been other questionnaires and studies about attitudes at Dowling, they had been general in nature whereas this study was more specific and examined the various areas of academic freedom. The study and its results will not solve the problem of different viewpoints nor perhaps even bring the two sides closer together in thinking.

This study was a descriptive research study, not an experimental or quasi-experimental one, that examined the differences, if any, statistically. The reader may obtain a clearer view of the differences that exist which may cause friction and unrest. For the effective management of an institution of higher education, there must be a basis of understanding. To survive the coming years, this understanding is essential.

Academic freedom, past, present and future, is a most important topic to be examined in the emergence of higher education in America. It can be the dividing force between faculty and administration or may be, if properly defined and mutually respected, the driving force towards

success. Academic freedom should not be used as the battle cry to halt progress. Academic freedom must be clearly delineated and respected, not misused or abused.

PROCEDURES

Instrument

Additional literature was researched in order to obtain a clearer view of what constitutes this freedom as established by the courts, tradition, and the needs of all concerned. From this search, a number of areas of academic freedom were selected and a questionnaire formulated. These areas included such as: elements of academic freedom (Q.1), the faculty and academic freedom (Qs.20, 21, 27), the relationship of the board of trustees to the faculty (Qs.2, 3, 6, 12, 13, 16, 17), the relationship of administration to the faculty (Qs.7, 17, 18), the election of officers (Qs.8, 9), standard setting (Qs.4, 5, 19), appointment procedures (Qs.10, 11,14, 15), tenure (Q.22), the relationship of faculty members with colleagues (Qs.23, 24, 25), the relationship of faculty members with students (Qs.34, 35), extramural activities (Qs.28, 29, 30), external pressures (Qs.18, 36), governance (Qs.26, 31, 33), the right to strike (Q.38) and other areas (Qs.32, 37). These questions were selected by peers from a longer list after a review for ambiguity and overlap. These particular questions were selected after it was explained to the faculty reviewers exactly what was

being looked for in this study. Their feeling was that these questions were the most relevant for the purposes of this study. A Likert scale of one to five - one being Strongly Agree; two being Agree; three Undecided; four being Disagree; and five being Strongly Disagree - was used in the answering of the questionnaire (Appendix A).

Distribution

This questionnaire was distributed to the sixty-six full-time members of the faculty of Dowling College and the three top administrators. Since this administration is small in number, the questionnaire was sent to the top three administrators at twelve other institutions on Long Island. One office was unfilled thus only thirty-five questionnaires were sent out. Sending out the questionnaire to other institutional administrators was done in order to obtain a broader view of what constitutes this controversial freedom in the minds of administrators in general.

Follow-up

Upon return of the initially distributed questionnaires, a follow-up procedure was instituted. Another written appeal to the faculty members of Dowling College was sent and a personal appeal was made at a faculty meeting. A follow-up letter was forwarded to those administrators who had not yet responded requesting that they do so. A second copy of the questionnaire and a

self-addressed envelope was included so those administrators that may have discarded the original questionnaire would have another chance to respond. This follow-up procedure was actually set into motion since the original response count was not high enough.

Tabulation

Upon return of the questionnaires, the results were tabulated for each group. The responses were tallied and using the following point values - four for Strongly Agree; three for Agree; two for Disagree; and one for Strongly Disagree - calculations were made to obtain a mean score for each question for each group. No value was assigned to the Undecided tallies or to those left blank. The mean was calculated by taking the point value times the number of respondents for that value, adding these together and dividing by the total number of tallies. Mean ratings near 4.0 reflect strong agreement. Conversely, those ratings near 1.0 reflect strong disagreement. Tables were used to exhibit the results of the ratings for each group for each question in the major categories of questions. Questions were categorized by area of academic freedom as oulined previously. A reader will be able to examine each question and each group of questions and determine the number of respondents from each group and how they responded as well as the mean ratings for each group for comparison purposes. From

these tables, a reader will be able to determine the different and shared perceptions of academic freedom held by the faculty of Dowling and administrators in general.

Limitations

Certain limitations were encountered. The faculty of Dowling College, which is a small liberal arts college, numbers sixty-six while the administration numbers only three. This small number of respondents may not have given a clear picture of the perceptions of the two groups, however the input received from external administrators may have added clarity to the viewpoint of administrators. Overall, a clear image of the two groups' viewpoints on this most important topic may not have appeared.

RESULTS

Upon receipt of the questionnaires, tabulations were made of the responses and a mean score for each question for each group was determined. Since this study was a descriptive research study, not an experimental or quasi-experimental one, the responses were not compared statistically. Rather, the mean scores for each group are to be interpreted by the reader. Different and common viewpoints were revealed. Comments by various authors add some light to the disparities and the common viewpoints. This study is not all inclusive in that it did not examine

every area of academic freedom nor did it cover responses other than those from one college faculty and administrators from several Long Island colleges and universities. The views disclosed, therefore, are somewhat parochial and may or may not have expressed the viewpoints of educators nationwide. However, readers can replicate this study in their particular geographic areas and can, if so desired, add or delete questions as deemed appropriate. The responses were categorized in areas of academic freedom as originally listed in this study and exhibited in individual tables.

Respondents

Questionnaires were sent out to the sixty-six faculty members of Dowling as listed in the Dowling College directory, eight of whom were on sabbatical and therefore did not respond. Three others were librarians who, because of their positions, did not respond. This left a pool of fifty-five potential respondents. Of these, forty faculty members responded to the original request and the follow-up request. A seventy-three percent response rate was received from the faculty. Questionnaires were sent to a total of thirty-eight administrators - three at Dowling College and thirty-five at twelve other colleges and universities on Long Island. Two questionnaires were returned from other institutions stating that the individual to whom it was sent was no

longer in that administrative position, thus lowering the pool to thirty-six potential administrator respondents. One administrator at a major state university did not respond due to a major academic freedom issue that was being settled at the time and he was deeply involved in the settling of the issue. The issue was one that was highly publicized in the local media and was extremely controversial, therefore, he did not feel it appropriate to answer this particular questionnaire. Copies of internal reports and published reports on the issue were sent, however. The potential pool of administrator respondents was therefore lowered to thirty-five. With twenty-eight administrators responding, the response rate was eighty percent, slightly higher than the faculty rate.

Scoring

Questionnaire responses were tabulated and mean scores calculated by assigning point values to each response as follows - four for Strongly Agree; three for Agree; two for Disagree; and one for Strongly Disagree. No point value was assigned to the category of Undecided or to blank responses, therefore, the Undecideds and blanks were not used in calculating the mean scores of the two groups.

A mean score near 4.0 reflects strong agreement. Conversely, a mean score near 1.0 reflects strong disagreement. Mean scores of faculty members and

administrators that are close in value designate general agreement in perception. Mean scores that are vastly different designate general disagreement in perception between the two groups. The degree of disparity that can be considered important may differ with individual readers using their own standards and judgments. For purposes of this study, however, a difference of .5 between the two groups' scores was considered important. Percentages, when used, were rounded to the nearest full percent.

Elements of Academic Freedom

The first question dealt with three elements of academic freedom as viewed by the respondents. There was little disparity between the groups as to the first and second elements - freedom of inquiry and research and freedom of teaching within the university or college. A disparity was noted, however, when the topic of freedom of extramural utterances was mentioned. The faculty mean score and the mean score of administrators for the third element, freedom of extramural utterances and action, indicated that a different viewpoint existed. The faculty mean score was 3.24 while the administrators' mean score was 2.73, a difference of .51. A mean of 2.73 falls in the area of Disagree to Agree while a mean of 3.24 falls in the area of Agree to Strongly Agree. A difference of .51, for purposes of this study, is considered important as it shows a different perception.

Thirty-nine (98%) of the faculty and twenty-eight (100%) of the administrators agreed that academic freedom is a freedom of inquiry and research. Thirty-four (85%) of the faculty felt it is the freedom of teaching as did twenty-six (93%) of the administrators. Results for this question were tabulated and exhibited in Table 1.

Table 1

Elements of Academic Freedom

Question		Number of Responses and Means						
Faculty n = 40 Administrators n = 28								
Key	1. Strongly Agree 2. Agree. 3. Undecided. 4. Disagree. 5. Strongly Disagree. 6. Blank.							
			1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	Mean
1. Academic freedom comprises three elements:									
a. freedom of inquiry and research;		Fac.	34	5		1			3.83
		Adm.	22	6					3.79
b. freedom of teaching within the university or college;		Fac.	21	13	2	1		3	3.57
		Adm.	12	14			1	1	3.37
c. and freedom of extra-mural actions & utterances.		Fac.	5	12	6	5	1	1	3.24
		Adm.	7	7	2	10	2		2.73

The Faculty and Academic Freedom

In this particular area, there was general agreement between the faculty and the administrators. Both groups agreed that faculty members should not use their positions as instructors to advance opinions irrelevant to the course being taught and that academic freedom should not be considered as a privilege to promote the interests of the protected.

Question 21 stated that academic freedom is claimed by professors as a special privilege solely in their own interest. This was a rewording of Question 27. Both groups expressed disagreement with the statement in Question 21 although there was a higher degree of disagreement on the part of the faculty. Twenty-two (55%) of the faculty respondents expressed disagreement with Question 21 while only twelve (43%) of the administrators did. Thirty-one (78%) of the faculty respondents agreed with the statement in Question 27 that academic freedom should not be understood as privileges designed to promote the interests of the protected. Twenty-eight (100%) of the administrators agreed with this statement. Five (13%) of the faculty respondents were undecided on this point and one (3%) left it blank. Three (8%) faculty respondents disagreed with the statement. The results for these three questions are exhibited in Table 2.

Table 2

The Faculty and Academic Freedom

Question		Number of Responses and Means						
Faculty	n = 40							
Administrators	n = 28							
Key:	1. Strongly Agree.							
	2. Agree.							
	3. Undecided.							
	4. Disagree.							
	5. Strongly Disagree.							
	6. Blank.							
		1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	Mean
Q.20 A faculty member should not use his/her position to advance his/her opinion on issues irrelevant to the courses he/she is teaching (AAUP).	Fac.	17	13	1	7	1	1	3.21
	Adm.	10	15		3			3.25
Q.21 It has been said that academic freedom is claimed by professors as a special privilege in their own interests (Joughin)	Fac.	3	7	7	11	11	1	2.06
	Adm.	1	10	4	12		1	2.52
Q.27 Academic freedom should not be understood as privileges designed to promote the interests of the protected (Encyclopedia).	Fac.	13	18	5	3		1	3.29
	Adm.	9	19					3.32

Relationship of the Board of Trustees to the Faculty

In four of the seven questions in this area, there were differences of opinion and in three there were common views, keeping in mind that a .5 difference in group mean scores was considered important.

Question 2 mentioned the major function of the Board as being to assist the faculty in fund raising and as intermediaries. The faculty generally agreed with this statement while admininstrators did not. Only six (21%) administrators agreed with the statement.

Question 3 stated that upon the board rests the determination of the measure of academic freedom which is to be realized. The faculty mean score was 1.57 while the administrators' mean score was 2.81. Only three (8%) of the faculty respondents agreed with this statement and five (13%) respondents were undecided. Thirty-two (80%) disagreed with the statement. Nineteen (68%) of the administrators agreed and seven (25%) disagreed with the statement.

Questions 6, 12, and 17 dealt with the autonomy and prerogatives of the faculty in the areas of teaching and research. The administrators were not in agreement with the faculty as to autonomy over matters related to curriculum, course content and conduct of teaching and research. Twenty-seven (68%) of the faculty strongly agreed that the board should assure autonomy in these

areas while only six (21%) administrators strongly agreed. Overall, thirty-four (85%) of the faculty members and eighteen (64%) of the administrator respondents to the survey agreed.

Question 12 dealt with the prerogatives of faculty members. While there was disagreement in Question 6, there was agreement in Question 12. Thirty-four (85%) of the faculty and twenty-four (86%) of the administrators agreed that the board must fully recognize the prerogatives of faculty members. When the prerogatives are spelled out, as in Question 6, administrators disagreed yet in Question 12, they agreed to the principle of assuring these prerogatives. In Question 1, there was agreement between the two groups in the areas of inquiry, research and teaching yet in Question 6, there was less agreement in these same areas, perhaps due to uncertainty as to what these prerogatives actually are.

Twenty-four (86%) of the administrators and thirty-six (90%) of the faculty agreed that trustees have no moral right to bind the reason or the conscience of any professor. Question 16 stated that the lack of proper distinction between the responsibility of the board and that of the faculty is accentuated by a lack of effective communication between them. Thirty-five (88%) of the faculty members and nineteen (68%) of the administrators agreed with the statement. The results in this area are exhibited in Table 3.

Table 3

Relationship of the Board of Trustees to the Faculty

Question		Number of Responses and Means						
Faculty	n = 40							
Administrators	n = 28							
Key:	1. Strongly Agree							
	2. Agree.							
	3. Undecided.							
	4. Disagree.							
	5. Strongly Disagree.							
	6. Blank.							
		1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	Mean
Q.2 The major function of the Board of Trustees is to assist the faculty in financial affairs, especially in fund-raising, and to act as intermediaries between academic and mundane interests (Encyclopedia).	Fac.	16	15		8		1	3.21
	Adm.	1	5		18	3	1	2.15
Q.3 Upon the board rests the determination of the measure of academic freedom which is to be realized in the college (AAUP).	Fac.		3	5	14	18		1.57
	Adm.	3	16	1	6	1	1	2.81
Q.6 Boards should assure to their faculties full autonomy over all matters specifically related to the curriculum, the content of courses, and the conduct of teaching and research (MacIver).	Fac.	27	7	1	5			3.56
	Adm.	6	12	1	8	1		2.85

Table 3 (Continued)

Relationship of the Board of Trustees to the Faculty

Question		Number of Responses and Means						
Faculty	n = 40							
Administrators	n = 28							
Key:	1. Strongly Agree 2. Agree. 3. Undecided. 4. Disagree. 5. Strongly Disagree. 6. Blank.							
		1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	Mean
Q.12 The Board of Trustees must fully recognize the prerogatives of faculty members (MacIver).	Fac.	27	7	2	2			3.67
	Adm.	8	16	3			1	3.33
Q.13 Trustees have no moral right to bind the reason or the conscience of any professor (AAUP).	Fac.	29	7	2	2			3.71
	Adm.	12	12	2	1	1		3.35
Q.16 The lack of proper distinction between the responsibility of the board and that of the faculty is accentuated by the lack of effective communication between them (MacIver).	Fac.	17	18	2	1	2		3.32
	Adm.	2	17	4	4		1	2.91
Q.17 The function of administration is to enable the scholars to fulfill their function (MacIver).	Fac.	21	15	3	1			3.54
	Adm.	5	16	2	5			3.00

Relationship of the Administration to the Faculty

When questionned about the administration's right to have some say in the selection of materials and texts used within the institution, thirty-one (78%) of the faculty disagreed while only fourteen (50%) of the administrators disagreed. The faculty mean score for this question (7) was 1.74 while the mean score of the administrators was 2.63. For purposes of this study, this is an important difference.

Question 18 suggested that administrators should protect the faculty against the demands of outside forces such as the alumni, donors, politicians, the press, and the general public. Twenty-two (55%) of the faculty agreed with this statement, however seven (18%) were undecided. Twelve (43%) administrators agreed, however, seven (25%) were undecided or left it blank when answering.

The statement (Q.17) that the function of the administration is to enable the scholars to fulfill their function was agreed to by thirty-six (90%) of the faculty respondents and twenty-one (75%) of the administrator respondents. No individual in either group strongly disagreed with this statement. The mean score of the faculty was 3.54 and the mean score of the administrators was 3.00. The results of the questions in this particular area are exhibited in Table 4.

Table 4

Relationship of the Administration to the Faculty

Question		Number of Responses and Means						
Faculty n = 40 Administrators n = 28								
Key: 1. Strongly Agree 2. Agree. 3. Undecided. 4. Disagree. 5. Strongly Disagree. 6. Blank.								
		1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	Mean
Q.7 The administration should have some say in the selection of materials and texts used within the institution (Encyclopedia).	Fac.	2	5	2	12	19		1.74
	Adm.	4	9	1	14			2.63
Q.17 The function of the administation is to enable the scholars to fulfill their function (MacIver).	Fac.	21	15	3	1			3.54
	Adm.	5	16	2	5			3.00
Q.18 Administrators should protect the faculty against the demands of outside forces such as the alumni, donors, politicians, the press and the general public (MacIver).	Fac.	15	7	7	11			3.12
	Adm.	2	10	5	9		2	2.67

The Election of Officers

There was a difference of opinion with regards to Question 8 which stated that the Board of Trustees has full authority to elect the president and other officers. This difference was an important difference for purposes of this study and as defined in this study. The mean score of faculty members was 2.64 while that of the administrators was 3.56. Twenty-five administrators (89%) agreed that it was the Board's responsibility and that it was the Board that had full authority. Only sixteen (40%) of the faculty respondents agreed to this statement, however seven (18%) faculty members were undecided or left this blank whereas only one (4%) administrator was undecided and none left it blank. There was agreement as to the statement in Question 9 which was that the Board of Trustees should consult with faculty members in the search of a new president. Thirty-eight (95%) of the faculty respondents and twenty-three (82%) of the administrator respondents who responded agreed with this statement. Three (11%) administrators marked the questionnaire Undecided and two (7%) administrators disagreed with the statement whereas only one (3%) faculty member marked the questionnaire Undecided and only one (3%) faculty member disagreed with the statement. The results for the questions in this particular section are exhibited in Table 5.

Table 5

The Election of Officers

Question		Number of Responses and Means						
Faculty n = 40 Administrators n = 28								
Key: 1. Strongly Agree 2. Agree. 3. Undecided. 4. Disagree. 5. Strongly Disagree. 6. Blank.								
		1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	Mean
Q.8 The Board of Trustees has full authority to elect the president and other officers (MacIver).	Fac.	8	8	5	14	3	2	2.64
	Adm.	17	8	1	2			3.56
Q.9 The Board of Trustees should consult with faculty members in the search for a new president (MacIver).	Fac.	29	9	1		1		3.69
	Adm.	12	11	3	2			3.40

Standard Setting

Both groups agreed that the role of trustees is to assure that the standards of the institution are sustained and advanced (Q.4). The two groups did not agree, however, that the Board of Trustees has full authority to direct the college's educational policies (Q.5). Twenty (71%) administrators felt this was the case but thirty-one (78%) faculty did not. Both groups,

however, did agree that there is a joint responsibility of the faculty, administration and board in areas of admissions, finance, and new institutional developments. The results for this section are exhibited in Table 6.

Table 6

Standard Setting

Question		Number of Responses and Means						
Faculty n = 40 Administrators n = 28								
Key: 1. Strongly Agree 2. Agree. 3. Undecided. 4. Disagree. 5. Strongly Disagree. 6. Blank.								
		1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	Mean
Q.4 The role of trustees is to assure that the standards of the institution are sustained and advanced (MacIver).	Fac.	9	19	5	4	3		2.97
	Adm.	12	11		5			3.25
Q.5 The Board of Trustees has full authority to direct the college's educational policies (MacIver).	Fac.	2	5	2	17	14		1.87
	Adm.	6	14		6	1	1	2.93
Q.19 There is a joint responsibility of the faculty, administration and board in areas of admissions, finance, and new institutional developments (Encyclopedia)	Fac.	16	21	1	1	1		3.33
	Adm.	7	15	2	3		1	3.16

Appointment Procedures

Exactly half of the administrators agreed with the statement (Q.10) that the Board of Trustees has full authority to appoint faculty members whereas thirty-two (80%) of the faculty disagreed with the statement. Question 11 noted that Boards should not make appointments, transfers, promotions, or dismissals except on the advice of the president after consultation with the faculty. There was agreement between the groups in this area. Thirty-seven (93%) faculty respondents and twenty-four (86%) adminsistrators agreed that such should be the case. Faculty and administrators agreed that there must be no condition of appointment or controls over promotion that would give preference to those whose views are more congenial to administative authorities (Q.14). Thirty-seven (93%) of the faculty and twenty-three (82%) of the administrators agreed with this principle. There was disagreement with the principle (Q.15) that faculty status and related matters are primarily a faculty responsibility. This included appointment, reappointment, decisions not to reappoint, promotions, tenure and dismissal. Twenty-nine (73%) of the faculty respondents agreed while only eleven (39%) of the administrators agreed and sixteen (57%) disagreed. Only nine (23%) of the faculty disagreed. The results for these four questions are exhibited in Table 7.

Table 7

Appointment Procedures

Question		Number of Responses and Means						
Faculty	n = 40							
Administrators	n = 28							
Key:	1. Strongly Agree.							
	2. Agree.							
	3. Undecided.							
	4. Disagree.							
	5. Strongly Disagree.							
	6. Blank.							
			1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	Mean
Q.10 The Board of Trustees has full authority to appoint faculty members (MacIver).	Fac.		1	5	2	19	13		1.84
	Adm.		5	9		12	2		2.61
Q.11 Boards should not make appointments to academic positions or promotions or transfers or dismissals except on the advice of the president, who in turn should have previously consulted with appropriate faculty or the faculty as a whole (MacIver).	Fac.		17	21	2				3.45
	Adm.		12	12	1	3			3.33
Q.14 There must be no conditions of appointment or controls over promotion designed so as to give preference to those whose views are more congenial to administrative authorities (MacIver).	Fac.		31	6	1	1	1		3.72
	Adm.		11	12	1	4			3.26

Table 7 (Continued)

Appointment Procedures

Question		Number of Responses and Means						
Faculty	n = 40							
Administrators	n = 28							
Key:	1. Strongly Agree.							
	2. Agree.							
	3. Undecided.							
	4. Disagree.							
	5. Strongly Disagree.							
	6. Blank.							
			1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	Mean
Q.15 Faculty status and related matters are primarily a faculty responsibility; this area includes appointments, reappointments, decisions not to reappoint, promotions, the granting of tenure, and dismissal (Joughin).	Fac.		15	14	2	8	1		3.13
	Adm.		2	9	1	10	6		2.26

Tenure

A difference of opinion between the two groups was observed here. Question 22 stated that academic freedom cannot be secured without academic tenure. Twenty-one (53%) of the faculty agreed and fourteen (35%) disagreed with the statement. Five faculty members (13%) were undecided. Twenty-one administrators (75%) disagreed with the statement and only one (4%) was undecided. The results for this question are exhibited in Table 8.

Table 8

Tenure

Question		Number of Responses and Means						
Faculty	n = 40							
Administrators	n = 28							
Key:	1. Strongly Agree.							
	2. Agree.							
	3. Undecided.							
	4. Disagree.							
	5. Strongly Disagree.							
	6. Blank.							
			1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	Mean
Q.22 Academic freedom cannot be secured without academic tenure (Joughin).	Fac.	11	10	5	8	6		2.74
	Adm.		6	1	14	7		1.96

Relationship of Faculty Members With Colleagues

Both groups agreed that professors have obligations to other members of the profession not to bring discredit upon the profession (Q.23). The mean scores were almost identical - 3.53 for the faculty and 3.59 for the administrators. Both groups also agreed that professors should defend the academic freedom of colleagues and not try to impose their beliefs upon them (Q.24). No faculty member disagreed with this statement nor did any administrator, however, one administrator was undecided and one left the response blank. The faculty mean score was 3.70 while the administrators' mean score was 3.42. Question 25 stated that it was improper and in violation

of academic freedom for a majority of some representative group to speak for the entire academic body and publicize statements of an "official" position of the faculty. Thirty (75%) faculty members agreed with this statement while six (15%) disagreed with it. Twenty administrators (71%) agreed while six (21%) disagreed. The results for these questions are exhibited in Table 9.

Table 9

Relationship of Faculty Members with Colleagues

Question		Number of Responses and Means						
Faculty	n = 40							
Administrators	n = 28							
Key:	1. Strongly Agree.							
	2. Agree.							
	3. Undecided.							
	4. Disagree.							
	5. Strongly Disagree.							
	6. Blank.							
			1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	Mean
Q.23 The professor has obligations to other members of the profession not to bring discredit upon the profession (Joughin).	Fac.	22	14	2	2			3.53
	Adm.	16	11	1				3.59
Q.24 A professor should defend the academic freedom of colleagues and not try to impose his/her beliefs upon them (Joughin).	Fac.	28	12					3.70
	Adm.	11	15	1			1	3.42

Table 9 (Continued)

Relationship of Faculty Members with Colleagues

Question		Number of Responses and Means						
Faculty	n = 40							
Administrators	n = 28							
Key:	1. Strongly Agree.							
	2. Agree.							
	3. Undecided.							
	4. Disagree.							
	5. Strongly Disagree.							
	6. Blank.							
		1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	Mean
Q.25 It is improper and in violation of academic freedom for a majority of some representative group to speak for the entire academic body and publicize statements of an "official" position of the faculty (Encyclopedia).	Fac.	16	14	3	6		1	3.28
	Adm.	10	10	1	5	1	1	3.69

Relationship of Faculty Members With Students

Administrators and faculty members tended to disagree with the concept that students in committees (particularly the Personnel Committee) is an impingement on the academic freedom of the professor (Q.34). Thirty (75%) faculty members disagreed with this statement and fifteen (54%) administrators disagreed. Five (18%) administrators were undecided and two left it blank, whereas only one (3%) faculty member was undecided. Nine

(23%) faculty members did agree with the statement, however, as did six (21%) administrators. When questioned about the evaluation of professors by students which becomes a basis for renewal/promotion being an impingement of academic freedom (Q.35), thirty (75%) faculty members disagreed and twenty-five (89%) of the administrators disagreed. Six (15%) faculty members agreed that it was an impingement; three were undecided and one left it blank. Only one (4%) administrator was undecided in this area and none left it blank. Table 10 exhibits the results for these two questions.

Table 10

Relationship of Faculty Members with Students

Question		Number of Responses and Means						
Faculty	n = 40							
Administrators	n = 28							
Key:	1. Strongly Agree.							
	2. Agree.							
	3. Undecided.							
	4. Disagree.							
	5. Strongly Disagree.							
	6. Blank.							
		1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	Mean
Q.34 Participation of students in committees (particularly the Personnel Committee) is an impingement on the academic freedom of the professor (Encyclopedia).	Fac.	5	4	1	22	8		2.15
	Adm.	1	5	5	12	3	2	2.19

Table 10 Continued

Relationship of Faculty Members with Students

Question		Number of Responses and Means						
Faculty	n = 40							
Administrators	n = 28							
Key:	1. Strongly Agree.							
	2. Agree.							
	3. Undecided.							
	4. Disagree.							
	5. Strongly Disagree.							
	6. Blank.							
		1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	Mean
Q.35 The evaluation of professors by students which becomes a basis for renewal/promotion is an impingement on the academic freedom of the professor (Encylopedia).	Fac.	4	2	3	19	11	1	1.97
	Adm.		2	1	19	6		1.85

Extramural Activities

Both groups disagreed with the statement that radical social/political groups should not be allowed to organize on campus. Question 26 and Question 36 had the highest number of individuals answering Undecided. Thirty (75%) faculty members disagreed as did eleven (39%) administrators. Twice as many administrators (10) were undecided as were faculty members (5). Question 29 dealt with the idea of having controversial individuals address the student body. Thirty-four (85%) faculty members felt that highly controversial individuals should be allowed.

Twenty-five (89%) administrators agreed. Both groups agreed that a faculty member has the freedom to express radical political beliefs in class (Q.30). Twenty-eight (75%) of the faculty and fourteen (50%) of the administrators agreed. The results for these three questions are exhibited in Table 11.

Table 11

Extramural Activities

Question		Number of Responses and Means						
Faculty n = 40 Administrators n = 28								
Key: 1. Strongly Agree. 2. Agree. 3. Undecided. 4. Disagree. 5. Strongly Disagree. 6. Blank.								
		1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	Mean
Q.28 Radical social/political groups should not be allowed to be organized on campus (IFI).	Fac.	2	3	5	17	13		1.83
	Adm.		5	10	11	2		1.70
Q.29 Highly controversial individuals should not be allowed to address students (IFI).	Fac.	1	2	3	14	20		1.57
	Adm.		2	1	19	6		1.85
Q.30 Academic freedom gives the faculty member the freedom to express radical political beliefs in class (IFI).	Fac.	10	18	3	6	3		2.95
	Adm.	1	13	4	6	3	1	2.53

External Pressures

Twice as many faculty members agreed (22) as disagreed (11) to the statement that administrators should protect the faculty against the demands of outside forces (Q.18). Seven (18%) faculty members were undecided, however, as were five (18%) administrators. Two (7%) administrators left the response blank. Twelve (43%) of the administrators agreed while nine (32%) disagreed. The mean score of the faculty respondents was 3.12 and the mean score of the administrator respondents was 2.67.

Both the faculty and the administrators disagreed with the concept that donors and governors under the mantle of academic freedom have the freedom to supervise the educational activities and aims of the schools they oversee and support (Q.36). Nine (23%) faculty members and six (21%) administrators were undecided, however. Additionally, four (14%) administrators did not respond to the question. Twenty-two (55%) faculty members disagreed as did fifteen (54%) administrators. Only three (11%) of the administrators felt that donors and governors had this right, whereas nine (23%) faculty members felt that such was the case. The mean score of the faculty respondents was 2.03 and the mean score of the administrator respondents was 2.06. Reponses to these two particular questions are exhibited in Table 12.

Table 12

External Pressures

Question		Number of Responses and Means						
Faculty n = 40 Administrators n = 28								
Key: 1. Strongly Agree. 2. Agree. 3. Undecided. 4. Disagree. 5. Strongly Disagree. 6. Blank.								
		1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	Mean
Q.18 Administrators should protect the faculty against the demands of outside forces such as the alumni, donors, politicians, the press, and the general public (MacIver).	Fac.	15	7	7	11			3.12
	Adm.	2	10	5	9		2	2.67
Q.36 "Academic freedom must mean the freedom of men and women to supervise the educational activities and aims of the schools they oversee and support." This statement referred to donors and governors (Buckley).	Fac.	1	8	9	13	9		2.03
	Adm.	1	2	6	12	3	4	2.06

Governance

Question 26 stated that the business of university faculty is teaching, not legislation nor administration. Faculty respondents and administration respondents alike agreed with the statement. Twenty-one (53%) faculty members agreed and ten (25%) disagreed while nine (23%) faculty members were undecided on this issue. Twenty (71%) administrators agreed and six (21%) disagreed. The mean score for the faculty was 2.84 while the mean score for administrators was 2.92.

There was a disagreement between the groups in answering Question 31 which stated that the pattern of institutional governance in essential ways impinges on academic freedom. Fifteen (38%) faculty members agreed while fourteen (35%) disagreed. Nine (23%) members were undecided and two (5%) left it blank. Only three (11%) administrators agreed, twenty (71%) disagreed, and five (18%) were undecided. There was a .75 difference in mean scores with the faculty mean being 2.66 and the administrators' mean being 1.91.

Faculty and administrators agreed that academic freedom includes the right to participate in institutional government (Q.33). Thirty-four (85%) faculty members felt this was the case while five (13%) faculty members did not. Sixteen (57%) administrators agreed and seven (25%) disagreed. Five (18%) administrators were undecided on

this issue. The mean score of the faculty respondents was 3.21 and the score of the administrators was 2.74. These responses are exhibited in Table 13.

Table 13

Governance

Question		Number of Responses and Means						
Faculty n = 40 Administrators n = 28								
Key: 1. Strongly Agree. 2. Agree. 3. Undecided. 4. Disagree. 5. Strongly Disagree. 6. Blank.								
		1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	Mean
Q.26 The business of university faculties is teaching. It is not legislation and it is not administration (MacIver).	Fac.	6	15	9	9	1		2.84
	Adm.	4	16	1	6		1	2.92
Q.31 The pattern of institutional governance in essential ways impinges on academic freedom (Encyclopedia).	Fac.	5	10	9	13	1	2	2.66
	Adm.		3	5	15	5		1.91
Q.33 Academic freedom includes the right to participate in the institutional government (Encyclopedia).	Fac.	14	20	1	4	1		3.21
	Adm.	3	13	5	5	2		2.74

Right to Strike

Faculty members disagreed with the idea that the right to strike may be an impingement of academic freedom of students and those who do not wish to strike while the administrators tended to agree (Q.38). Twenty-two (55%) faculty members disagreed and fourteen (35%) agreed with the statement, with four (10%) undecided. Fifteen (54%) administrators felt that the right to strike may be an impingement on this freedom, however, six (21%) administrators were undecided. The results for this question are exhibited in Table 14.

Table 14

Right to Strike

Question		Number of Responses and Means						
Faculty	n = 40							
Administrators	n = 28							
Key:	1. Strongly Agree.							
	2. Agree.							
	3. Undecided.							
	4. Disagree.							
	5. Strongly Disagree.							
	6. Blank.							
		1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	Mean
Q.38 The right to strike may be an impingement of the academic freedom of students and those who do not wish to strike (Encyclopedia).	Fac.	2	12	4	12	10		2.17
	Adm.	5	10	6	6		1	2.95

Other Areas

There was general agreement between the two respondent groups that there should be editorial freedom in student publications provided that there is no discrimination to any individual (Q.32). Thirty-seven (93%) of the faculty members agreed and twenty-two (79%) of the administrators agreed. Three (11%) administrators were undecided on this issue and one administrator (4%) left it blank. Only three (8%) faculty members and two (7%) administrators disagreed with the statement. The mean score of the faculty respondents on this question was 3.30 and the mean score of the administrator respondents was 3.08.

Both groups also agreed that the justification of academic freedom lies in the benefits which society at large, not any special group, derives from it (Q.37). Thirty-six (90%) of the faculty and twenty-five (89%) of the administrators agreed with this statement on the justification of academic freedom. Only one (3%) faculty member disagreed but two (5%) faculty members were undecided on this issue and one (3%) faculty member left it blank. Three (11%) administrators disagreed with the statement. The mean score of the faculty respondents was 3.49 while the mean score of the administrators was 3.07. The results for these two particular questions are exhibited in Table 15.

Table 15

Other Areas

Question		Number of Responses and Means						
Faculty n = 40 Administrators n = 28								
Key: 1. Strongly Agree. 2. Agree. 3. Undecided. 4. Disagree. 5. Strongly Disagree. 6. Blank.								
		1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	Mean
Q.32 There should be editorial freedom in student publications provided there is no discrimination to any individual (Encyclopedia).	Fac.	16	21		2	1		3.30
	Adm.	4	18	3	2		1	3.08
Q.37 The justification of academic freedom lies in the benefits which society at large, not any special group, derives from it (Encyclopedia).	Fac.	20	16	2		1	1	3.49
	Adm.	6	19		2	1		3.07

DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

DISCUSSION

Elements of Academic Freedom

There are many definitions of academic freedom and what comprises it. Although academic freedom draws on a legacy of assumptions, it did not become crystallized in

this country until as late as 1915 when the General Report on Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure was published by the newly founded American Association of University Professors (Metzger, 1969:2). Joughin (1969:6) stated that academic freedom, tenure, and academic due process form a triad which brings together the deep regard of the civilized world for knowledge and the practical forms of protection needed by academic workers. Joughin (1969: 35-38) further stated that the teacher is entitled to full freedom in research and in the publication of the results; that the teacher is entitled to freedom in the classroom to discuss his subject; and that he should be free from institutional censorship or discipline. Joughin stated that teachers should have permanent or continuous tenure terminated only for adequate cause and then due process should be granted.

The three elements of academic freedom mentioned in Question 1 were proposed as part of the 1915 Declaration of Principles of the AAUP. Joughin (1969:158) stated that the first element is almost everywhere safeguarded and that dangers of its infringement are slight. The high degree of agreement by the respondents would tend to corroborate this statement. Joughin went on to state that the third element has more frequently been the occasion of difficulties and controversies than the first two elements. The responses of the two groups and the difference between the mean scores would indicate that

this could and probably would be the case. There was a difference of .51 between the mean scores.

Fuchs (1964:14) stated that academic freedom has been expanded . . . . to protect the liberty to participate in extramural as well as intramural activities. MacIver (1967:9) stated that academic freedom is an institutional freedom claimed by the educator within the institution. MacIver also stated that the faculty member should be careful not to associate his institution in any way with his extra-academic utterances or actions and that he should avoid any public behavior that would bring discredit on his institution. Joughin (1969:36) agreed when he stated that men of learning should remember that the public may judge their profession and their institutions by their utterances. Joughin felt that professors should make every effort to indicate that they are not institutional spokesmen. These statements were in no way intended to take away the professors' rights to free speech, rather it urged all to protect the institutions in which they work and to protect the very substance of academic freedom itself. It is easy to see how this element of academic freedom can be abused.

The Faculty and Academic Freedom

In this area there was general agreement between the faculty and administrators. Both groups agreed that faculty should not use their positions to advance opinions

irrelevant to the course being taught and that academic freedom should not be considered as a privilege to promote the interest of the protected. MacIver (1967:11) noted:

> This freedom is not to be thought of as a privilege, not as a concession, nor as something that any authority inside or outside the institution may properly grant or deny, qualify or regulate, according to its interest or its discretion. It is something instead that is inherently bound up with the performance of the university's task, something as necessary for that performance as pen and paper, a classroom and students, as laboratories and libraries.

Machlup also stated that academic freedom is in the interest of society at large, not just in the interest of the professors and for this reason is defended. Machlup contended that this freedom is not defended for the professors' sake, and does not mainly work for their benefit. Machlup further stated that

> Academic freedom is a right of the people, not a privilege of the few . . . . it is not sought as a personal privilege, although scholars enjoy the activities it permits.

Society as a whole has much to gain from academic freedom. The administrators and faculty appear to be in accord with Joughin who compiled the major documents on academic freedom into his handbook, "Academic Freedom and Tenure." Thirty (75%) of the faculty members and twenty-five (89%) of the administrator respondents agreed that faculty members should not use their positions to advance opinions irrelevant to the course being taught (Q.20). Thirty-one (78%) of the faculty member respondents and twenty-eight (100%) of the administrator respondents agreed that

academic freedom should not be understood as a privilege to promote the interests of the protected (Q.27). This is in accord with the views of both authors, MacIver and Joughin.

Question 21 stated that academic freedom is claimed as a special privilege solely in the professors' interest. Both groups disagreed with this particular statement. This question was a rewording of Question 27. Ten (25%) faculty members felt that academic freedom is claimed by professors as a special privilege. Eleven (39%) administrators felt the same way. There was a degree of indecision in regard to this question as well. Seven (18%) faculty members and four (14%) administrators were undecided and one member of each group left it blank. Faculty members and administrators felt academic freedom should not be claimed as a special privilege, yet felt that this freedom is claimed in that way. It is a right that allows faculty members to carry on their roles as teachers, not to advance their own interests according to most writers on the subject of academic freedom.

Relationship of the Board of Trustees to the Faculty

There were seven questions in this area. In four questions, there were differences of opinion and in three, there were common views, keeping in mind that a .5 difference is being considered important for the purpose of this study.

Question 2 mentioned the major function of the Board as being to assist the faculty in fund raising and as intermediaries. Thirty-one (78%) faculty members agreed with this statement while twenty-one (75%) administrators disagreed with it. Joughin (1969:97) stated that the board

> . . . . is responsible for obtaining needed capital and operating funds; and in the broadest sense of the term it should pay attention to personnel policy.

Joughin (1969:97) went on to say that

> When ignorance or ill-will threatens the institution or any part of it, the governing board must be available for support. In grave crises it will be expected to serve as a champion.

DeBardeleben (1969:84) stated that "A governing board should protect the faculty against all outside pressures which would divert them from scholarly pursuits." MacIver (1955:8) stated that it was the duty of governing boards and all administrative officials to protect the faculty against the clamors and demands of those who do not appreciate the goals of scholarship.

Question 3 stated that upon the Board of Trustees rests the determination of the measure of academic freedom which is to be realized in an institution. Thirty-two (80%) of the faculty respondents disagreed with this particular statement while nineteen (68%) of the administrators agreed with it. Actually, eighteen (45%) of the faculty respondents strongly disagreed. Only three (8%) of the faculty members agreed and five (13%) were

undecided on the issue. Faculty members, at least at Dowling College, felt that academic freedom is not a gift to be doled out by the Board but is an inherent right of the profession. Fuchs (1964:15) stated that

> Academic freedom, however, is by no means wholly or even largely dependent on formal protection for its strength and survival. To a large extent it exists and is recognized because of professional tradition and because it resides inherently in the functions of teaching, learning, and research. Faculty members in colleges and universities are usually not employed to follow orders but to render instruction and to pursue inquiries in their fields of of competence, largely free of supervision and direction.

Fuchs agreed that the board does not determine the measure of academic freedom but that tradition does. Yet the 1915 Declaration of Principles of the AUUP stated that "Upon them (the Board) finally it devolves to determine the measure of academic freedom which is to be realized . . . ." (Joughin, 1969:158). The faculty at Dowling College agreed with Fuchs while the administrators agreed with the 1915 Declaration. Obviously, this could be a source of trouble between the Dowling College faculty and the administration and/or between the faculty and the Board of Trustees.

Questions 6, 12, and 17 dealt with the autonomy, prerogatives and functions of the faculty and the Board's handling of such matters. Administrators agreed that Boards should assure to their faculty members full autonomy over all matters specifically related to the

curriculum, the content of courses, and the conduct of teaching and research, however the administrators' mean score (2.85) was lower than the that of the faculty (3.56). Nine (32%) administrators disagreed with this statement while only five (13%) of the faculty disagreed with it. MacIver (1967:75) contended that

> The mode of instruction, the direction of research, the laying out of the curriculum, the content of the courses, the assessment of student performances, and the determination of admission and degree requirements are matters properly belonging to particular departments, to particular faculties or schools within the institution, and to the teaching body as a whole.

It was MacIver (1967:76) who stated the premise of the question. He further stated that this principle alone, were it fully observed, would remove many of the major perils that beset academic freedom in this country. The 1966 AAUP Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities stated that

> The faculty has primary responsibility for such fundamental areas as curriculum, subject matter and methods of instruction, research, faculty status, and those aspects of student life which relate to the educational process (Joughin, 1969:98).

Both respondent groups agreed that the Board of Trustees must fully recognize the prerogatives of faculty members (Q.12). Thirty-eight (95%) of the faculty respondents and twenty-four (86%) of the administrator respondents agreed on this point. While there was some degree of disagreement between the respondents groups in Question 6, there was agreement in question 12. It would

appear then that there is disagreement or uncertainty as to just what the prerogatives of the faculty are. Generally, the administrator respondents agree that the Board of Trustees must recognize these prerogatives but disagree when they are spelled out. MacIver (1967:79) stated that

> Evidence makes it clear that a major factor in the disturbances of academic freedom that occur in various parts of the country is the frequent lack of rapport between governing boards and faculties.

Good rapport is essential. Allowing faculty members to fulfill their function and to enjoy their prerogatives is essential to the development of this rapport. Question 16 stated that the lack of proper distinction between the responsibility of the board and that of the faculty is accentuated by the lack of effective communication between them. Both groups agreed to this statement and the lack of effective communication could explain the lack of rapport between the two groups.

Both groups also agreed on the concept that the function of the administration is to enable scholars to fulfill their function (Q.17). Thirty-six (90%) and twenty-one (75%) of the faculty and administrators respectively agreed with this concept. There was general agreement between the groups in Question 1 that academic freedom is comprised of freedom of inquiry and research and freedom of teaching, therefore, there must be some uncertainty as to what else constitutes faculty

prerogatives and faculty functions. DeBardeleben (1969: 84) stated that

> A governing board has the responsibility of safeguarding and fostering an environment and an atmosphere unqualifiedly conducive to the free and untrammeled search for truth.

MacIver (1967:72) stated that it was no coincidence that the colleges and universities of highest repute - and usually those with the longest established traditions - have boards that fully recognize the prerogatives of the faculty.

When questioned about the function of the Board of Trustees in financial affairs (Q.2), there was a difference of 1.06 in mean scores - 3.21 for the faculty respondents and 2.15 for the administrator respondents. Thirty-one (78%) of the faculty members agreed that the major function of the Board of Trustees was to assist the faculty in financial affairs and to act as intermediaries between academic and mundane interests while twenty-one (75%) of the administrator respondents disagreed with the statement. This difference by itself should not be the cause of an academic freedom disturbance but added to other misunderstandings could add fuel to a fire. Joughin (1969:97) stated that

> The board plays a central role in relating the likely needs of the future to predictable resources; it has the responsibility for husbanding the endowment; it is responsible for obtaining needed capital and operating funds . . . .

Twenty-one (75%) administrators disagreed when they

answered this question. It is inconceivable that they would do so in the normal context but since the question stated that the "major" function was fund-raising, the narrow definition would appear to be the reason for the disagreement.

Relationship of the Administration to the Faculty

Question 7 is related to Question 6 in that it stated that the administration should have some say in the selection of materials and texts used. Thirty-one (78%) of the faculty disagreed with this idea. The faculty mean score was 1.74 while the administrators' mean score was 2.63. A score of 2.63 would tend to indicate agreememt on any question, however, upon examining the responses it was seen that fourteen administrators disagreed with the statement and only thirteen agreed with it. It is the weighting that gives the appearance of agreement. Most writers, including those mentioned in this study, agree that the faculty should have autonomy in the curriculum, the course content and the texts and materials selected (Q.7) since these comprise the course content.

Administrators and faculty agreed that administrators should protect the faculty against the demands of outside forces such as the alumni, donors, politicians, the press and the general public (Q.18). Seven (18%) faculty members and five (18%) administrators were undecided on this point. Additionally, two (7%)

administrators did not respond. In this regard, MacIver (1967:72) stated that the standards of the institution must be sustained and advanced and that this can be done by jealously protecting the integrity of education itself and by highly respecting the collective judgment of the body of scholars who constitute the very being of the institution. MacIver (1967:86) further stated that it is the president who must deal with serious charges and complaints and, therefore, has the primary duty of warding off attacks on the liberty of teaching and research. The administration has the responsibility of protecting academic freedom against all attacks - external and internal. Dodds (1964:172) contended that the

> . . . . administrator expects to take the rap, to shelter those under attack, for he knows that academic freedom is diminished and distorted if intimidation, either overt or covert, prevails.

DeBardeleben (1969:84) wrote the statement that is the basis for this question. DeBardeleben also stated that administrators should protect the faculty and the students against all outside pressures which would divert them from their scholarly pursuits. Without such protection, academic freedom would surely have been lost long ago and education as it is known today would probably be much different.

The Election of Officers

The faculty members were almost evenly split (sixteen or 40% agreed and seventeen or 43% disagreed) on

the statement that the Board of Trustees has full authority to elect the president and other officers of the educational institution while twenty-five (89%) of the administrator respondents agreed with this particular statement (Q.8). On the other hand, both respondent groups agreed that the Board of Trustees should consult with faculty members in the search for a new president (Q.9). Thirty-eight (95%) faculty member respondents and twenty-three (82%) administrator respondents agreed to this concept. It is evident that the administrators feel that the board of trustees should consult with the faculty in the search for a new president but that the board of trustees has full authority to elect the new president. The faculty respondents overwhelmingly agreed that the board of trustees should consult with them but were split in their response to the concept that the board of trustees has full authority to elect the new president.

MacIver (1967:71) stated that the Board of Trustees is normally invested with full authority over all institutional decisions; that all matters of policy come within its jurisdiction; that the board has full authority to determine the affairs of the institution, to direct its educational policies, to elect its president and other officers, to appoint its faculty members, and to prescribe its discipline. In the eyes of the law, the board of trustees is the institution. Not all would agreed with this statement, however.

MacIver (1967:72) further stated that

> It is no coincidence that the universities of highest repute - and usually those with the longest established traditions - have boards that fully recognize the prerogatives of the faculty. Such boards, when the occasion arises to choose a president, seek for one who is acceptable to the faculty and who understands their problems, frequently enlisting, formally or informally, the advice of the faculty in making their selection.

Joughin (1969:90) quoted from the 1966 Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities:

> Joint effort of a most critical kind must be taken when an institution chooses a new president. The selection of a chief administrative officer should follow upon cooperative search by the governing board and the faculty.

The Statement also stated that the governing board operates, with few exceptions, as the final institutional authority. As seen in Question 8, the faculty were split on this, thus leaving open the door to future conflict.

The 1915 Declaration of Principles of the AAUP was quoted by MacIver (1967:155) as follows: "American institutions of learning are usually controlled by boards of trustees as the ultimate repositories of power." DeBardeleben (1969:84) also stated that the governing board should consult with representatives of the faculties whenever the necessity for the selection of a new president exists. He went on to state that a governing board should not appoint as president any person who does not have a general consensus of approval of the faculty.

Most writers agree that the board has full authority to select/elect the president but they also

agree that the board should consult with the faculty. In this study, both faculty and administrators agreed upon the consultation but disagreed as to the full authority of the board. This could lead to future problems if a new president was one that could not command the respect and cooperation of the faculty or if respect and cooperation were withheld due to lack of input into the selection process.

Standard Setting

There was agreement between the groups on the idea that the role of the trustees is to assure that the standards of the institution are sustained and advanced (Q.4) as well as on the idea that there is a joint responsibility of the faculty, administration and board in areas of admissions, finance, and new institutional developments (Q.19). On Question 4, the role of trustees in standard setting, twenty-eight (70%) faculty members agreed, however there were five (13%) faculty members who were undecided on this point. Twenty-three (82%) administrators agreed and five (18%) disagreed with the statement.

Disagreement between the two groups was seen in Question 5 which stated that the Board of Trustees has full authority to direct the college's educational policies. Thirty-one (78%) of the faculty members disagreed with this statement while twenty (71%) of the

administrators agreed with it. This confirmed the responses in Question 2 which stated that the major function of the Board of Trustees is to assist the faculty in financial affairs. The faculty agreed and the administrators disagreed with the statement in Question 2.

MacIver (1967:71) stated that

> The Board of Trustees of the college or university is normally invested with full authority over all institutional decisions. All matters of policy come within its jurisdiction . . . . But the general rule is that the Board of Trustees has full authority to determine the affairs of the institution, to direct its educational policies . . . .

MacIver (1967:71-72) further stated that

> The right to make final decisions need not and should not involve the actual determination of all policies. The obligation it entails will be best fulfilled by the ratification, in matters requiring special competence, of policies made by those who have the requisite qualifications. The role of trustees is in the first place to assure that the standards of the institution are sustained and advanced. They can fulfill this role only if they jealously protect the integrity of education itself and highly respect the collective judgment of the body of scholars who constitute the very being of the institution.

MacIver (1967:72) further stated that when a board dictates to an administration and ignores the judgment of the faculty, you will find an institution divided against itself, that has lost academic standing, and that suffers gross violations of academic freedom. It is no coincidence that the universities of highest repute have boards that recognize the prerogatives of the faculty.

Most faculty members would agree with MacIver and other writers who have stated similar thoughts that boards should share their decision making authority. The responses of the Dowling College faculty made this clear. The administrators, in Question 5, felt the board has full authority to direct policies yet go on to agree in Question 19 that there is a joint responsibility in policy matters. If such a belief was implemented into practice, there would be few grievances on the part of faculty members in the matter of policy setting.

Appointment Procedures

The questions in this section are also related to the authority of the board versus the prerogatives of the faculty. Question 10 stated that the board has full authority to appoint faculty members and Question 11 stated that the board should not make appointments, promotions, transfers or dismissals without the advice of the president after consultation with the faculty. As could be expected, the faculty disagreed with the concept that the board has full authority to appoint faculty (Q.10). It was interesting to note, however, that administrators were evenly split on this question. Thirty-eight (95%) of the faculty and twenty-four (86%) of the administrators agreed that boards of trustees should not make appointments without consulting with the faculty (Q.11).

In question 15, there was disagreement between the groups that faculty status and related matters are primarily the responsibility of the faculty. This is the other side of the coin to Question 10 which stated that the Board of Trustees had full responsibility. Twenty-nine (73%) of the faculty felt it was the faculty's responsibility while only eleven (39%) of the administrators did. Sixteen (57%) administrators disagreed with this concept. Generally, administrators felt that the board had the major responsibility and authority in running institutions of higher education.

Debardeleben (1969:84) stated that a governing board should consult with the faculty through the president before making appointments, promotions, dismissals, etc. of faculty members. Joughin (1969:40) quoted the AAUP 1958 Statement on Procedural Standards in Faculty Dismissal Proceedings:

> A necessary precondition of a strong faculty is that it have first-hand concern with its own membership. This is properly reflected both in appointments and in separations from the faculty body.

Joughin (1969:40) also quoted the AAUP 1966 Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities:

> Faculty status and related matters are primarily a faculty responsibility; this area includes appointments,reappointments, decisions not to reappoint, promotions, the granting of tenure, and dismissal.

The statement did state however that these matters should first be handled through established procedures, and

reviewed by the chief academic officers with the concurrence of the board. This appears to be the generally accepted norm of operations in this area.

There was agreement by both groups that there must be no conditions of appointment or controls over promotion designed so as to give preference to those whose views are more congenial to administrative authorities (Q.14). Obviously, if such conditions did prevail, there would be serious repercussions. Academic freedom would be attacked in a back-handed manner. That must not occur.

Tenure

Joughin (1969:230) stated that tenure, or the right, after a probationary period, to hold one's professional post continuously until the age of retirement, is the bulwark of academic freedom. It guarantees freedom of teaching, freedom of research, and freedom of extramural activities. DeBardeleben (1969:70) wrote:

> Essential to the maintenance of academic freedom is a system of tenure based upon rules assuring that once a faculty member has achieved tenure status, he cannot be discharged except for good cause shown, upon reasonable notice, and following a fair hearing.

Fuchs (1964:1) wrote that tenure rights bestow economic security as well as forestall restrictions on freedom that might stem from the power to dismiss. Murphy (1964:40) reported that the importance of tenure and academic due process has been recognized by academic authorities

without exception. Others have also stressed the importance of tenure in their writings.

That academic freedom could not be secured without academic tenure (Q.22) was a statement that brought out disagreement between the Dowling College faculty and the administrator respondents. Twenty-one (53%) faculty members agreed that such was the case while fourteen (35%) disagreed. Five (13%) faculty members members were undecided on this point as was one (4%) administrator. Twenty-one (75%) administrators disagreed with the statement and only six (21%) agreed with it. With this kind of response pattern, it would be easy to envision a conflict due to this concept of academic freedom being tied to tenure.

Relationship of Faculty Members With Colleagues

One area of agreement dealt with the relationship of faculty members with colleagues. There was general agreement that a professor has obligations not to bring discredit upon the profession (Q.23). This consensus is not unique to the teaching profession. It is obvious that most professionals would have answered the question in the same way in regards to their own profession. Thirty-six (90%) of the faculty and twenty-seven (96%) administrators agreed with this statement. Van Den Haag (1964:97) quoted from the AAUP 1940 Statement of Principles when he wrote the following about a professor:

> As a man of learning and an educational officer, he should remember that the public may judge his profession and his institution by his utterances.

MacIver (1967:227) stated that it is the obligation of the professor to uphold the honor of his institution and not to bring discredit to it. By extension, this relates to the teaching profession as well.

Forty (100%) of the faculty and twenty-six (93%) administrators agreed that professors should defend the academic freedom of colleagues and not try to impose their beliefs upon them (Q.24). MacIver (1967:227) that in the age of specialization where departments divide faculty, the esprit de corps of the faculty is easily dissipated and that violations of academic freedom to others may bring indifference and apathy. This should and must not be. Each member must defend the freedom of each other member or else academic freedom will die battle by battle.

Both the faculty (75%) and the administrators (71%) agreed that it is improper and in violation of academic freedom for a majority of some representative group to speak for the entire academic body and publicize statements of an "official" position of the faculty (Q.25). This has happened at Dowling and probably at other institutions as well. In one situation, a statement voted on favorably by a majority of the faculty, was published in a Long Island paper. To some, this was a violation of their academic freedom since it was presented as if the entire faculty had agreed on the issue as it was

presented in the press. There were some members of the faculty who voted against the motion being debated and even more voted against the idea of publishing what was finally voted upon.

Respect for professional colleagues and the defense of their academic freedom was one area that evoked a consensus of agreement. Joughin (1969:89) quoted from the AAUP 1966 Statement on Professional Ethics:

> As a colleague, the professor has obligations that derive from common membership in the community of scholars. In the exchange of criticism and ideas he shows due respect for the opinions of others. He acknowledges his academic debts and strives to be objective in his professional judgment of colleagues.

DeBardeleben (1969:90) contended that

> An important part of the responsibility of the faculty to oppose, without equivocation, compromise, or accommodation, every assault upon or threat to academic freedom is the duty to sustain each other.

Relationship of Faculty Members With Students

The role of students on committees, such as the Personnel Committee, and in student evaluations which become the basis for renewal/promotion and whether these activities were an impingement on the academic freedom of the professor was the topic of Questions 34 and 35. Generally, it was agreed that these activities were not an impingement. Participation on committees such as the Personnel Committee (Q.34) was not an impingement according to thirty (75%) of the faculty and fifteen (54%)

of the administrators, however, seven (25%) administrators were undecided or left it blank.

The topic of evaluation of professors by students (Q.35) was also not seen as an impingement. Thirty (75%) faculty and twenty-five (89%) administrators disagreed that it was an impingement. Six (15%) faculty agreed that it was an impingement and four (10%) were undecided or left it blank. This response pattern was not unexpected since at the time of this study almost 75% of the faculty were tenured and not subject to student evaluations.

Machlup, in The Encyclopedia of Education (1971: 10), stated that any arrangement for participation of students in the government of the the institution or any of its parts should be based upon their competence in the matters to be decided. Machlup further contended that no one can reasonably argue that the academic freedom of students requires that they participate in decisions on matters of professional promotions or appointments and the contrary argument, that such participation would violate the academic freedom of professors, is far more convincing. Nevertheless, Machlup continues, students should be free to give their views on the effectiveness of the teaching of their professors and professors would be wise to listen to their evaluations and suggestions. When these evaluations are so strongly relied upon, as they are at Dowling, then there is a question of impingement on academic freedom.

Extramural Activities

Question 28 stated that radical social/political groups should not be allowed to be organized on campus. From a historical viewpoint, this idea took on a totally different meaning in earlier years than it does today. Both groups disagreed with this statement. Thirty (75%) of the faculty disagreed while thirteen (46%) of the administrators disagreed. There was, however, the highest number of respondents undecided on this question - ten (36%) administrators and five (13%) faculty members. There are the usual constitutional guarantees of freedom of speech, freedom of assembly, etc. that pertain to this question. Question 29 stated that highly controversial individuals should not be allowed to address students. Thirty-four (85%) of the faculty and twenty-five (89%) of the administrators disagreed with this concept. Question 30 stated that academic freedom gives a faculty member the freedom to express radical political beliefs in class. Twenty-eight (70%) of the faculty and fourteen (50%) of the administrators agreed that such was the case.

Moneypenny (1964:198) stated that restrictions on speeches and speakers on campus, restrictions on meetings and topics of discussion, on the distribution of leaflets and pamphlets, on demonstrations of sentiment and conviction by picketing and parading are unacceptable. By extension, then, this would apply to the organizing of

radical social/political groups. The proviso, however, as pointed out by Moneypenny (1964:198) is that there must be minimum requirements of safety, orderly traffic, and the protection of property.

MacIver (1967:238) stated that students and faculty have certain rights including:

1. the right to a private life free from controls that are not imposed upon other citizens; and
2. the right to exercise the same political and civil liberties that are enjoyed by other citizens.

MacIver (1967:63) further stated that

> . . . . it is the primary obligation of the scholar to avoid bias, that is not to permit his other interests to distort objectivity of his scholarship, or cloud his vision, or deflect his interpretation.

The SUNY Board of Trustees, as quoted by Neal (1983:4) stated that

> In the exercise of this freedom, the faculty member may, without limitation, discuss his own subject in the classroom; he may not, however, claim as his right the privilege of discussing in his classroom controversial matter which has no relation to his subject. The principle of academic freedom shall be accompanied by a corresponding principle of responsibility.

Marburger, President of SUNY at Stonybrook, (1983:3) repeated this last claim that academic freedom should be accompanied by the principle of responsibility. Neuberger (1983:6) stated that the key element of academic responsibility is the "need to present to students an objective analysis of all prevailing points of view." He further stated that while it is important that

controversial topics be discussed freely in the classroom, there is a need for extreme sensitivity in such coverage. There should be a reasonable correspondence between a course description and course content. The SUNY Senate Executive Committee in 1983 issued a statement saying that academic freedom means the right to teach controversial issues and ideas, the right to disagree with authority, and the right to free expression.

Professors are scholars and teachers and not propagandists for any particular viewpoint. They must be objective and present all viewpoints. This also applies to the idea that controversial individuals should be allowed to address students, however, it appears from various readings that a rounded view should be presented by offering those with opposing views the opportunity to present their views.

Freedom of speech and freedom of assembly are just as valid on campus as off. Therefore, students must be allowed to join groups of their own choosing and hear speakers of their own choosing. MacIver (1967:211) stated that

> . . . . no board or no administrative office and no faculty committee can be justified in censoring or otherwise curbing the expression of student opinion simply on the grounds that it is distasteful to authority; and that such action should be taken only on clear evidence that the group or organization subjected to it is transgressing the bounds of order or human decency, or sailing under false colors, or breaking the law, or flagrantly violating the standards or regulations of the academic community.

MacIver is, therefore, in accord with the thinking of Moneypenny. The Forty-third Annual Meeting (AAUP Bulletin, 43:363:1957) asserted the right of college and university students to listen to anyone whom they wish to hear, and affirmed its own belief that it is educationally desirable that students be confronted with diverse opinions of all kinds.

There is little doubt or difference of opinion among the leading writers on academic freedom that speakers should be allowed even if controversial. There is also little doubt that radical groups should be allowed to form on campus if so desired by students and that faculty members have the right to express radical political beliefs in class. Care must be taken, however, that it is within the context of the course. MacIver (1967:28-30) stated that professors should not regard the rostrum as a platform from which to broadcast opinions on issues irrelevant to the course being taught.

External Pressures

It was generally agreed that administrators should protect the faculty against the demands of outside forces (Q.18). Twenty-two (55%) faculty members and twelve (43%) administrators agreed. Nine (32%) administrators disagreed, however and seven (25%) were undecided or left the response blank while only seven (18%) of the faculty were undecided on this point.

Question 36 stated that the supporters and overseers of schools had the right to supervise the educational activities of these schools. Both groups disagreed with this concept. Mean scores were 2.03 for the faculty and 2.06 for the administrators. Nine (23%) faculty members were undecided and ten (36%) of the administrators were undecided or left it blank. This was the highest level of indecision recorded during the study.

A Commission at SUNY, Stonybrook reported (1984:1) that

> Any scholarly community must afford the opportunity for its members to engage in intellectual efforts without the imposition of a priori conditions or external restraints.

The Commission further stated (1984:3) that

> The pursuit of truth, and the acquisition and transmission of knowledge are, of necessity, dependent upon the practice and advancement of free and methodic inquiry. . . . . and further signify that such activities are to be carried out without external and arbitrary restraint.

Neal (1983:4) quoted from an AAUP Bulletin as follows:

> . . . . academic freedom consists in the absence of, or protection from such restraints and pressures . . . . as are designed to create in the minds of academic scholars fears and anxieties that may inhibit them from freely studying and investigating whatever they are interested in, and from freely discussing, teaching, or publishing whatever opinions they have reached.

Neal (1983:3) and Joughin (1969:184) both quoted Capen, a former president of the University of Buffalo as follows:

> If those who control a professor's employment attempt to place any metes and bounds whatsoever to academic freedom there is no academic freedom. . . . . Therefore trustees and presidents must

> interpose themselves between a justly outraged community and those whom they do not respect.

Administrators should ideally be the protectors of academic freedom against the pressures of outside forces. Joughin (1969:184) concluded that academic freedom implies protection from pressures and attempts to intimidate, no matter whence they come. DeBardeleben (1969:82) claimed that the encouragement of advancement of basic knowledge should never be dominated by considerations of practicality, popular whim, or current crisis. He further claimed that the governing body has an important role in the preservation of academic freedom against challenges from external forces and influences. It is generally accepted, based upon the writings of important educators, that the board and administrators should staunchly defend the academic freedom of faculties. This would include supporters and overseers of schools. Board members, as overseers, do have some responsibility in this regard.

Governance

Does academic freedom include the right to participate in the institutional government (Q.35)? Thirty-four (85%) of the faculty respondents thought that it does whereas only sixteen (57%) administrators thought so, however five (18%) of the administrators were undecided on this point. This right, if it does exist, is rarely mentioned in the many definitions of academic freedom.

Machlup (1971:8) stated that teaching, research and studying have traditionally been the three major protected activities of academic individuals. Machlup (1971:10) further stated that

> There is a fundamental difference between the individual's freedom as a right to be left alone and protected from pressures and interferences on the one hand and as a right to participate in collective decision-making on the other hand.

Machlup also claimed that any arrangement for participation of faculty in the governance of an institution should be based upon their competence in matters to be decided.

Joughin (1969:90) quoted from the 1966 Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities as follows:

> The variety and complexity of the tasks performed by institutions of higher education produce an inescapable interdependence among governing board, administration, faculty, students and others.

Joughin (1969:99) quoted this same Statement:

> Agencies for faculty participation in the governance of the college or university should be established at each level where faculty responsibility is present.

Question 26 stated that the business of faculties is teaching and that it is not legislation and it is not administration. Twenty-one (55%) faculty members agreed with this statement as did twenty (71%) administrators. Nine (23%) of the faculty were undecided on this point. This is a confusing and controversial issue. Note the different reactions to Question 26 and Question 33. Both groups agreed that academic freedom includes the right to participate in governance (Q.33) yet both groups also

agree that the business of faculties is teaching, not legislation and administration. Evidently a right is perceived but most feel it should not be exercised.

Does institutional governance impinge on academic freedom (Q.31)? There was a split in faculty reaction with fifteen (38%) thinking that it did and fourteen (35%) thinking that it didn't. Eleven (28%) faculty members were undecided or left it blank. Twenty (71%) administrators did not feel that the pattern of governance impinged on this freedom yet five (18%) were undecided.

Machlup (1971:10) stated that American history seems to point to trustees, donors, and university presidents as the major infringers of academic freedom. He further stated that violations of academic freedom by governing boards and presidents are the most notorious, however, there are also infringements by faculty and students. The mixed response rate by the faculty would tend to confirm this.

Right to Strike

Question 38 stated that the right to strike may be an impingement of the academic freedom of students and those who do not wish to strike. Fifteen (54%) of the administrators agreed that such was the case while six (21%) were undecided. It is interesting to note that twenty-two (55%) of the faculty disagreed with the statement. This response was from a faculty who were the

first at a private institution in New York to unionize and who have had two bitter strikes in the past ten years.

Machlup (1971:20) stated that "The freedom of any member of the academic community certainly does not include a right to encroach on the rights of others." Machlup further stated that

> One of the oldest problems is the right of cessation, withholding of services, or strike; this action may be deemed necesary as a weapon in the defense against a violation of academic freedom and yet may constitute a violation of the academic freedom of others. If professors strike in order to exert pressure on an "irresponsible" administration, they may "irresponsibly" injure the rights of their students.

Kadish (1969:34) stated "The professional strike and the forms of unionization based upon its use are rapidly developing into a major challenge to our traditional academic ways." Kadish (1969:52) further stated that when professors do strike, they do so despite the fact that the provision of the service of education and research is central to their professional commitments. Providing the services of the university is a pivotal element of the professor's professionalism.

Strikes have an unsettling effect on the free pursuit of scholarship and education. As seen by some, a strike is an impingement on the rights and academic freedom of students and of those who do not wish to strike. The faculty evidently did not see a strike as an encroachment on the rights of others. A strike is not a step that should be taken lightly, however.

Other Areas

Should there be editorial freedom in student publications provided there is no discrimination to any individual (Q.32)? Thirty-seven (93%) of the faculty felt that such was the case as did twenty-two (79%) of the administrators. Four (14%) administrators were undecided or left it blank, however.

This is an important topic of discussion at the present time at Dowling. The student newspaper and the Letters to the Editor column in particular have recently been used by students to vent their emotions against a certain new member of the faculty because of his teaching and his alleged demeanor in the classroom. These writings were follow-ups to complaints to the administration and poor evaluations (SIRs) by the students of this professor. As a result of these actions, the administration has declined to renew his contract contrary to the recommendations of the Faculty Personnel Committee and the Faculty Administration Senate that he be given another year to straighten out his act. This declination has resulted in an appeal to the faculty union and may eventually result in a grievance. The union, however, is concerned with the Administration's using a new criterion for professional evaluation - the vocal and written comments of disgruntled students regardless of the merit of their complaints. Only time will tell the result of

this situation. No one has yet raised the issue of academic freedom but the questions of propriety and libel have been raised in regards to the editor for printing such letters and editorially commenting upon them.

The United States Constitution, of course, demands freedom of speech and of the press. Other legislation, however, requires that discrimination be avoided. Is it discrimination, however, when students write about their experiences in a particular course and with a particular professor? The professor claims that libel was the result. A court will have to decide if such is the case.

Machlup (1971:9) stated that other student activities protected under formulated principles of students' rights and freedoms include editorial freedom of student publications without censorship or sanctions for contents or form of the views published. MacIver (1967: 205) stated that

> The freedom to express and to defend his views or his beliefs, the freedom to question and to differ, without authoritative repercussion and without scholastic penalization, is the academic freedom the student particularly needs.

MacIver (1967:210) further stated:

> . . . . that no board and no administrative office and no faculty committee can be justified in censoring or otherwise curbing the expression of student opinion simply on the ground that it is distasteful to authority, and that such action should be taken only on clear evidence that the group or organization subjected to it is transgressing the bounds of order or common decency, or sailing under false colors, or breaking the law, or flagrantly violating the standards or regulations of the academic community.

Joughin (1969:70) quoted the 1967 Joint Statement on Rights and Freedoms of Students as follows:

> Student publications and the student press are a valuable aid in establishing and maintaining an atmosphere of free and responsible discussion and of intellectual exploration on the campus. They are means of bringing student concerns to the attention of the faculty and the institutional authorities and of formulating student opinion . . . .

Freedom of speech and freedom of the press must be respected, however, the good name and reputation of others must not be defamed. Anything published should be verifiable and accurate and within the bounds of equity and fairness as well as good taste. This particular case will be fought for some time to come and may result in its coming to the courts. Further comment on its merits or lack of merits would be counter-productive at this time. The key issue here is the academic freedom of students - the freedom to learn and their freedom of speech.

IMPLICATIONS

The implications are many and serious for Dowling College. Academic freedom has been used and abused at Dowling as it has at most other institutions for decades. Policies dealing with the various issues of academic freedom must be clarified just as the American Association of University Professors did in 1915 when they saw the need for an overall policy on academic freedom. The Association's purpose as set forth in its Constitution is

"to facilitate a more effective cooperation among teachers and research scholars . . . ." (Joughin, 1969:7). This cooperation is often difficult to attain particularly between teachers and administrators, as indicated by some of the responses to this study, but attained it must be.

Metzger (1971:22) pointed out that those engaged in or involved with higher education have failed to educate themselves on one of the essential issues of higher education - academic freedom. It may not be as he stated but it is a fact that many ignore what they have learned. This is especially true at Dowling College.

The future functioning of Dowling College may well rest upon the present faculty and administration. Negotiations must be entered into with a clear understanding of the implications for the entire college, not just for one side or the other. The Dowling community has brought itself from the brink of economic disaster and internal governmental disaster. It must not allow any back-sliding at this point. The cooperation that has developed between the faculty and the administration, limited though it may be, should not be lost due to some issue of academic freedom.

One immediate implication for the College is the case of student freedom of the press. That issue, a very sensitive one, must be resolved and the underlying issue of faculty evaluation criteria settled once and for all. Without a resolution of this issue, many other issues that

may be minor at best may suddenly take on additional weight and present stumbling blocks to amicable relations.

Another issue that must be resolved and has serious implications for the faculty is the question of who has control over scheduling. Traditionally, faculty members made up their own schedule within their division and discipline and presented the schedule to the administration. That is still being done, however, the administration has taken upon itself certain prerogatives of the faculty and has been rescheduling certain courses. This has presented some problems and will create more serious ones if an amicable solution is not worked out. It is understandable how the problem has arisen since enrollment is at an all-time high and room space must be allocated more carefully. Everyone realizes this problem but it is the "solution" that is now the problem. What is really a logistics problem may become an academic freedom problem. This must be avoided at all costs. The avoidance can be peaceful if all sides would just talk out the problem rather than let it fester and become more severe with each semester.

Dowling must remain an institution committed to the pursuit of knowledge and truth. This can only be accomplished through the exercise of academic freedom and responsibility. This applies to both sides - faculty and administration. The SUNY Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities (1984:2) made this clear when it wrote:

> Failure of members of a university community to act responsibly would undermine the integrity and invalidate the authority of the university, and thereby render it less effective as an intellectual force in society.

Tenure, in the eyes of most, is an indispensable part of academic freedom. Tenure must be granted on merit based upon tradition in higher education and in each institution. It cannot be used as a weapon, overtly or covertly, to force faculty members into line. This applies to both the faculty who have a say in the granting or non-granting of tenure as well as to the administration. The granting of tenure should be a non-political decision. Criteria for the granting of tenure should be clearly spelled out, yet one implication of trouble for Dowling is that they are not that clear.

Other implications or indications of possible problems at Dowling are as follows:

1. The actions or activities that should be restrained or should be allowed are not spelled out.
2. The guarantees and safeguards for this freedom are not clearly spelled out in college policies.
3. The faculty and the administration have different viewpoints, as indicated in this study, of some very important and serious areas of academic freedom.
4. The decision as to whether Dowling College should establish a core curriculum required for all students or keep the present "menu" of elective courses must be resolved once and for all. Academic freedom is at issue

here since the administration presently leans toward the "core" approach and the faculty feel that the administration is forcing its will upon the faculty in opposition to the concept of academic freedom.

5. The idea that a strike is not an impingement on the academic freedom of students or those who do not wish to strike being imbedded in the faculty has serious implications for the future. Should some issue arise before or during negotiations, this faculty just might institute a strike action with serious repercussions.

Too much is taken for granted. The recommendations made herein may set the groundwork for a better understanding in the future.

RECOMMENDATIONS

As Joughin (1969:VI) pointed out, members of the educational profession should be encouraged to take stock of where they stand so that points of further growth and understanding can be found. This requires a clear understanding of the present position of each member and each group and some reconciliation between diverse opinions.

Certain recommendations resulted from this study. These recommendations are listed below, not in any priority order, however.

1. A Joint Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities (or some similar name) should be established so that any problems dealing with academic

freedom issues and governance can be clarified and adjudicated before they become major problems.

2. The above listed committee should examine the issue of what comprises academic freedom, particularly in the area of extramural utterances and activities (Q.1).

3. A committee comprised of Board members, administrators, and representative faculty should examine the relationship of the Board and Administration to the faculty (Qs. 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 13, 16, 17) with the goal of lessening any tension that may exist and preventing future conflicts. The future working relationship could be well established now.

4. An agreement should be reached regarding the responsibility for directing the college's educational policies (Q.5).

5. An agreement should be reached regarding the responsibility for faculty status (Q.15). At the present time, there is an ongoing conflict as to who has responsibility for faculty personnel files. Both the Administration and the Faculty Personnel Committee claim they have the "official" personnel file.

6. Discussion should be undertaken regarding the granting or non-granting of tenure (Q.22). Clearer criteria should be established to remove this process from the political arena. Some pre-established or national standards should be utilized, not the whim of some Faculty Committee or Faculty Administration Senate and/or Administration.

7. Institutional governance procedures should be re-examined and clarified in a non-political and non-adversarial forum. A joint committee, not related to the union negotiation teams, could be such a group to study such problems (Qs.26, 31, 33).

8. The Administration and the faculty should begin to work more closely together in all areas of mutual concern. This would result in better working conditions for all and should also result in less breaches of academic freedom.

9. Professors should support and protect the academic freedom of their peers (Qs.23, 24, 25). Criticism and evaluation should be without prejudice or penalty.

10. Professors should present an objective analysis of the subject taught. All viewpoints should be presented for student analysis. Facts and views should be differentiated.

11. Strikes should be avoided at all costs since the students are the losers (Q.38). A strike must only be a last resort after all avenues of compromise have been traveled. The previous two faculty strikes have created an imbedded animosity between faculty and Administration that creeps to the surface occasionally. This animosity between the faculty and the administration must not be compounded by future strikes.

12. A greater consciousness of what constitutes academic freedom and what infringes upon it must be arrived at by all concerned (Q.1).

13. The upcoming negotiations on non-monetary items should be entered into with an open mind and a spirit of compromise. The future of Dowling may depend upon it. Joughin (1969:92) quoted from the 1966 Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities as follows:

> The variety and complexity of the tasks performed by institutions of higher learning produce an inescapable interdependence among governing board, administration, faculty, students, and others.

This interdependence must be recognized, examined and strengthened in the upcoming negotiations.

14. Professors should recognize and defend the academic freedom of students (Qs.34, 35).

15. Clear guidelines for the academic freedom of students and their publications must be established so that legal problems are avoided (Q.32). Students editors should be carefully advised of their responsibilities for truth and justice.

16. Better lines of communication should be established between the faculty and the Board of Trustees (Q.16).

Joughin (1969:7) stated that

> With almost unfailing regularity, the worst violations of academic freedom occur at institutions where the faculties either occupy ignoble positions without proper jurisdiction or power, or discover that, in a time of crisis, their supposed voice has no force.

The faculty at Dowling do not consider themselves as occupying ignoble positions and have a strong, although controversial, voice in governance. They want to strengthen their position while the Administration wants

to strengthen theirs. A major recommendation is that the subject of academic freedom and all that it comprises be examined jointly to clarify any diverse opinions as were pointed out in this study.

The maintenance of freedom of speech, publication, religion and assembly (each of which is a component of intellectual freedom) is the breath of life of a democratic society (Joughin, 1969:4). Academic freedom is the breath of life of academia. This freedom must be protected and defended just as much as the aforementioned freedoms must be and usually are.

Joughin (1969:176) stated that

> Academic freedom, tenure, and academic due process thus form a triad which brings together the deep regard of the civilized world for knowledge and the practical forms of protection needed by academic workers.

Sounds simple, however Joughin also pointed out that higher education goes on at a quite complicated level of human activity. Dodds (1964:176) contended:

> . . . . that the issue of academic freedom cannot be factored out as an isolated sector of college and university life. Its defense rests not on itself alone but on a comprehension of the whole educational process. The more constituents of a college or university understand the full scope and nature of this process, the more will academic freedom appear to them as desirable, even indispensable.

The mission of a college or university, and Dowling in particular, confers a high responsibility on the Board of Trustees, the Administration and the faculty alike. This responsibility must not be disregarded. The

college's function is to impart knowledge and to serve the community. It can only do so in an atmosphere of calm and mutual respect. Much of this respect can be the result of the mutual respect of academic freedom. Just as freedom of speech could be lost through a lack of diligence, so could academic freedom. All concerned must safeguard this wonderful and powerful freedom lest it be lost.

REFERENCES

American Association of University Professors. AAUP Bulletin 43: 363: 1957. Washington, D.C.: The Associations.

Commission on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities. Report to Provost Homer Neal. Stonybrook, N.Y.: SUNY, 1984.

DeBardeleben, Arthur. "The University's External Constituency." Dimensions of Academic Freedom. Chicago, Ill.: University of Illinois, 1969.

Dodds, Harold W. "Academic Freedom and the Academic President." Academic Freedom: The Scholar's Place in Modern Society. Hans W. Baade and Robinson O. Everett, editors. Dobbs Ferry, N.Y.: Oceana Publications, Inc., 1964.

Fuchs, Ralph F. " Academic Freedom - Its Basic Philosophy, Function, and History." Academic Freedom: The Scholar's Place in Modern Society. Hans W. Baade and Robinson O. Everett, editors. Dobbs Ferry, N.Y.: Oceana Publications, Inc., 1964.

Hofstadter, Richard and Walter P. Metzger. "Development of Academic Freedom in the United States." N.Y., N.Y.: Columbia Univesity Press, 1955.

Joughin, Louis. Academic Freedom and Tenure: A Handbook of the American Association of University Professors. Madison, Wisc.: University of Wisconsin Press, 1969.

Kadish, Sanford H. "The Strike and the Professoriat." Dimensions of Academic Freedom. Chicago, Ill.: University of Illinois, 1969.

Kirk, Russell Amos. Academic Freedom: An Essay in Definition. Chicago, Ill.: Regnery, 1955.

Machlup, Fritz. "Academic Freedom." The Encyclopedia of Education. N.Y., N.Y.: MacMillan Co. and The Free Press, 1971.

MacIver, Robert M. Academic Freedom in Our Time. N.Y., N.Y.: Gordian Press, 1955 (1st ed.) and 1967 (2nd ed.).

Marburger, John H. "President's Statement on the Controversy Surrounding AFS/POL 319, The Politics of Race." Stonybrook, N.Y.: SUNY, 1983.

REFERENCES (Continued)

Metzger, Walter P. Academic Freedom in the Age of the University. N.Y., N.Y.: Columbia University Press, 1969.

Middle States Self-Study Report. Oakdale, N.Y.: Dowling College, 1983.

Moneypenny, Phillip. "Toward a Standard for Student Academic Freedom." Academic Freedom: The Scholar's Place in Modern Society. Hans W. Baade and Robinson O. Everett, editors. Dobbs Ferry, N.Y.: Oceana Publications, Inc., 1964.

Murphy, William P. "Academic Freedom - An Emerging Constitutional Right." Academic Freedom: The Scholar's Place in Modern Society. Hans W. Baade and Robinson O. Everett, editors. Dobbs Ferry, N.Y.: Oceana Publications, Inc., 1964.

Neal, Homer A. "Report on AFS/POL 319, Summer Session I: A Report to the President." Stonybrook, N.Y.: SUNY, 1983.

Neuberger, Egon. "Dean's Statement on AFS/POL 319." Stonybrook, N.Y.: SUNY, 1983.

"University Senate Executive Committee Statement." Stonybrook, N.Y.: SUNY, 1983

Van Den Haag, Ernest. "Academic Freedom in the United States." Academic Freedom: The Scholar's Place in Modern Society. Hans W. Baade and Robinson O. Everett, editors. Dobbs Ferry, N.Y.: Oceana Publications, Inc., 1964.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

American Association of University Professors. AAUP Bulletin 43: 363: 1957. Washington, D.C.: The Associations, 1957.

American Association of University Professors. "The 1915 Declaration of Principles: Academic Freedom and Tenure." Washington, D.C.: The Associations, 1915.

American Association of University Professors. "The 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure." Washington, D.C.: The Associations, 1940.

Buckley, Wm. F., Jr. "God and Man at Yale: The Superstitions of Academic Freedom." Chicago, Ill.: Regnery, 1951.

Commission on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities. Report to Provost Homer Neal. Stonybrook, N.Y.: SUNY, 1984.

DeBardeleben, Arthur. "The University's External Constituency." Dimensions of Academic Freedom. Chicago, Ill.: University of Illinois, 1969.

Dodds, Harold W. "Academic Freedom and the Academic President." Academic Freedom: The Scholar's Place in Modern Society. Hans W. Baade and Robinson O. Everett, editors. Dobbs Ferry, N.Y.: Oceana Publications, Inc., 1964.

Emerson, Thomas I and David Haber. "Academic Freedom of the Faculty Member as a Citizen." Academic Freedom: The Scholar's Place in Modern Society. Hans W. Baade and Robinson O. Everett, editors. Dobbs Ferry, N.Y.: Oceana Publications, Inc., 1964.

Fuchs, Ralph F. "Academic Freedom - Its Basic Philosophy, Function, and History." Academic Freedom: The Scholar's Place in Modern Society. Hans W. Baade and and Robinson O. Everett, editors. Dobbs Ferry, N.Y.: Oceana Publications, Inc., 1964.

Hofstadter, Richard and Walter P. Metzger. "Development of Academic Freedom in the United States." N.Y., N.Y.: Columbia Univesity Press, 1955.

Hook, Sidney. "Responsibility and Academic Freedom." On Campus. Official Publication of AFT/AFL-CIO, Vol. #5, Feb. 1985.

BIBLIOGRAPHY (Continued)

"Institutional Functioning Inventory." Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1978.

Joughin, Louis. Academic Freedom and Tenure: A Handbook of the American Association of University Professors. Madison, Wisc.: University of Wisconsin Press, 1969.

Kadish, Sanford H. "The Strike and the Professoriat." Dimensions of Academic Freedom. Chicago, Ill.: University of Illinois, 1969.

Kirk, Russell Amos. Academic Freedom: An Essay in Definition. Chicago, Ill.: Regnery, 1955.

Machlup, Fritz. "Academic Freedom." The Encyclopedia of Education. N.Y., N.Y.: MacMillan Co. and The Free Press, 1971.

MacIver, Robert M. Academic Freedom in Our Time. N.Y., N.Y.: Gordian Press, 1955 (1st ed.) and 1967 (2nd ed.).

Marburger, John H. "President's Statement on the Controversy Surrounding AFS/POL 319, The Politics of Race." Stonybrook, N.Y.: SUNY, 1983.

Metzger, Walter P. Academic Freedom in the Age of the University. N.Y., N.Y.: Columbia University Press, 1969.

Middle States Self-Study Report. Oakdale, N.Y.: Dowling College, 1983.

Moneypenny, Phillip. "Toward a Standard for Student Academic Freedom." Academic Freedom: The Scholar's Place in Modern Society. Hans W. Baade and Robinson O. Everett, editors. Dobbs Ferry, N.Y.: Oceana Publications, Inc., 1964.

Murphy, William P. "Academic Freedom - An Emerging Constitutional Right." Academic Freedom: The Scholar's Place in Modern Society. Hans W. Baade and Robinson O. Everett, editors. Dobbs Ferry, N.Y.: Oceana Publications, Inc., 1964.

Neal, Homer A. "Report on AFS/POL 319, Summer Session I: A Report to the President." Stonybrook, N.Y.: SUNY, 1983.

BIBLIOGRAPHY (Continued)

Neuberger, Egon. "Dean's Statement on AFS/POL 319." Stonybrook, N.Y.: SUNY, 1983.

Rudolf, Frederick. The American College and University. N.Y., N.Y.: Alfred A. Knopf, 1962.

"University Senate Executive Committee Statement." Stonybrook, N.Y.: SUNY, 1983

Van Den Haag, Ernest. "Academic Freedom in the United States." Academic Freedom: The Scholar's Place in Modern Society. Hans W. Baade and Robinson O. Everett, editors. Dobbs Ferry, N.Y.: Oceana Publications, Inc., 1964.

APPENDIX A

ACADEMIC FREEDOM QUESTIONNAIRE

QUESTIONNAIRE ON ACADEMIC FREEDOM

This questionnaire is directed to faculty members and members of administration. Its purpose is to determine in what areas there is general agreement and in what areas there are differences.

Please answer the questions on a scale of one to five - one for Strongly Agree; two for Agree; three for Undecided; four for Disagree and five for Strongly Disagree. Please circle your response. Additional space has been provided for comments or clarifications of answers.

These questions are based upon the 1915 Declaration of Principles of the American Association of University Professors and the writings of others. The source of each reference is in parentheses at the end of each question.

Your cooperation is greatly appreciated.

Key:
1. Strongly agree.
2. Agree.
3. Undecided.
4. Disagree.
5. Strongly Disagree.

Q 1. Academic freedom comprises three elements: (AAUP)

a. freedom of inquiry and research;

1. 2. 3. 4. 5.

b. freedom of teaching within the university or college;

1. 2. 3. 4. 5.

c. and freedom of extra-mural utterances and actions.

1. 2. 3. 4. 5.

Q 2. The major function of the Board of Trustees is to assist the faculty in financial affairs, especially in fund-raising, and to act as intermediaries between academic and mundane interests (Encyclopedia).

1. 2. 3. 4. 5.

Key:
1. Strongly Agree.
2. Agree.
3. Undecided.
4. Disagree.
5. Strongly Disagree.

Q 3. Upon the board rests the determination of the measure of academic freedom which is to be realized in the college (AAUP).

1. 2. 3. 4. 5.

Q 4. The role of trustees is to assure that the standards of the institution are sustained and advanced (MacIver).

1. 2. 3. 4. 5.

Q 5. The Board of Trustees has full authority to direct the college's educational policies (MacIver).

1. 2. 3. 4. 5.

Q 6. Boards should assure to their faculties full autonomy over all matters specifically related to the curriculum, the content of courses, and the conduct of teaching and research (MacIver).

1. 2. 3. 4. 5.

Q 7. The administration should have some say in the selection of materials and texts used within the institution (Encyclopedia).

1. 2. 3. 4. 5.

Q 8. The Board of Trustees has full authority to elect the president and other officers (MacIver).

1. 2. 3. 4. 5.

Q 9. The Board of Trustees should consult with faculty members in the search for a new president (MacIver).

1. 2. 3. 4. 5.

Q 10 The Board of Trustees has full authority to appoint faculty members (MacIver).

1. 2. 3. 4. 5.

Key:
1. Strongly Agree.
2. Agree.
3. Undecided.
4. Disagree.
5. Strongly Disagree.

Q 11. Boards should not make appointments to academic positions or promotions or transfers or dismissals except on the advice of the president, who in turn should previously have consulted with the appropriate faculty or the faculty as a whole (MacIver).

1. 2. 3. 4. 5.

Q 12. The Board of Trustees must fully recognize the prerogatives of faculty members (MacIver).

1. 2. 3. 4. 5.

Q 13. Trustees have no moral right to bind the reason or the conscience of any professor (AAUP).

1. 2. 3. 4. 5.

Q 14. There must be no conditions of appointment or controls over promotion designed so as to give preference to those whose views are more congenial to administrative authorities (MacIver).

1. 2. 3. 4. 5.

Q 15. Faculty status and related matters are primarily a faculty responsibility; this area includes appointments, reappointments, decisions not to reappoint, promotions, the granting of tenure, and dismissal (Joughin).

1. 2. 3. 4. 5.

Q 16. The lack of proper distinction between the responsibility of the board and that of the faculty is accentuated by the lack of effective communication between them (MacIver).

1. 2. 3. 4. 5.

Q 17. The function of the administration is to enable the scholars to fulfill their function (Maciver).

1. 2. 3. 4. 5.

Key:
1. Strongly Agree.
2. Agree.
3. Undecided.
4. Disagree.
5. Strongly Disagree.

Q 18. Administrators should protect the faculty against the demands of outside forces such as the alumni, donors, politicians, the press, and the general public (MacIver).

1. 2. 3. 4. 5.

Q 19. There is a joint responsibility of the faculty, administration and board in area of admissions, finance, new institutional developments (programs, departments, divisions, etc.) (Encyclopedia).

1. 2. 3. 4. 5.

Q 20. A faculty member should not use his/her position to advance his/her opinion on issues irrelevant to the courses he/she is teaching (AAUP).

1. 2. 3. 4. 5.

Q 21. It has been said that academic freedom is claimed by professors as a special privilege solely in their own interests (Joughin).

1. 2. 3. 4. 5.

Q 22. Academic freedom cannot be secured without academic tenure (Joughin).

1. 2. 3. 4. 5.

Q 23. The professor has obligations to other members of the profession not to bring discredit upon the profession (Joughin).

1. 2. 3. 4. 5.

Q 24. A professor should defend the academic freedom of colleagues and not try to impose his/her beliefs upon them (Joughin).

1. 2. 3. 4. 5.

Key:
1. Strongly Agree.
2. Agree.
3. Undecided.
4. Disagree.
5. Strongly Disagree.

Q 25. It is improper and in violation of academic freedom for a majority or some representative group to speak for the entire academic body and publicize statements of an "official" position of the faculty (Encyclopedia).

1. 2. 3. 4. 5.

Q 26. The business of university faculties is teaching. It is not legislation and it is not administration (MacIver).

1. 2. 3. 4. 5.

Q 27. Academic freedom should not be understood as privileges designed to promote the interest of the protected (Encyclopedia).

1. 2. 3. 4. 5.

Q 28. Radical social/political groups should not be allowed to be organized on campus (IFI).

1. 2. 3. 4. 5.

Q 29. Highly controversial individuals should not be allowed to address students (IFI).

1. 2. 3. 4. 5.

Q 30. Academic freedom gives the faculty member the freedom to express radical political beliefs in class (IFI).

1. 2. 3. 4. 5.

Q 31. The pattern of institutional governance in essential ways impinges on academic freedom (Encyclopedia).

1. 2. 3. 4. 5.

Q 32. There should be editorial freedom in student publications provided there is no discrimination to any individual (Encyclopedia).

1. 2. 3. 4. 5.

Key:
1. Strongly Agree.
2. Agree.
3. Undecided.
4. Disagree.
5. Strongly Disagree.

Q 33. Academic freedom includes the right to participate in the institutional government (Encyclopedia).

1. 2. 3. 4. 5.

Q 34. Participation of students in committees (particularly the Personnel Committee) is an impingement on the academic freedom of the professor (Encyclopedia).

1. 2. 3. 4. 5.

Q 35. The evaluation of professors by students which becomes a basis for renewal/promotion is an impingement on the academic freedom of the professor (Encyclopedia).

1. 2. 3. 4. 5.

Q 36. "Academic freedom must mean the freedom of men and women to supervise the educational activities and aims of the schools they oversee and support." This statement referred to donors and governors. (Buckley).

1. 2. 3. 4. 5.

Q 37. The justification of academic freedom lies in the benefits which society at large, not any special group, derives from it (Encyclopedia).

1. 2. 3. 4. 5.

Q38. The right to strike may be an impingement on the academic freedom of students and those who do not wish to strike.

1. 2. 3. 4. 5.

COMMENTS: PLEASE FEEL FREE TO ADD COMMENTS OR QUALIFY YOUR ANSWERS. PLEASE IDENTIFY THE QUESTION(S) BEING COMMENTED ON OR ANSWERS QUALIFIED.

PLEASE CHECK ONE OF THE FOLLOWING:
FACULTY MEMBER____ MEMBER OF ADMINISTRATION____

QUESTIONNAIRE REFERENCES

American Association of University Professors. "The 1915 Declaration of Principles: Academic Freedom and Tenure." Washington, D.C.: The Associations, 1915.

Buckley, William F., Jr. God and Man at Yale: The Superstitions of Academic Freedom. Chicago, Ill: Regnery, 1951.

Institutional Functioning Inventory. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1978.

Joughin, Louis, ed. Academic Freedom and Tenure: A Handbook of the American Association of University Professors. Madison, Wis.: University of Wisconsin Press, 1969.

Kirk, Russell Amos. Academic Freedom: An Essay in Definition. Chicago, Ill.: Regnery, 1955.

Machlup, Fritz. "Academic Freedom." The Encyclopedia of Education. New York, N.Y.: MacMillan Co. and The Free Press, 1971.

MacIver, Robert m. Academic Freedom in Our Time. New York: Gordian Press, 1967.

Van Den Haag, Ernest. "Academic Freedom in the United States." Academic Freedom, The Scholar's Place in Modern Society. Hans W. Baade and Robinson O. Everett, editors. Dobbs Ferry, N.Y.: Oceana Publications, Inc., 1964.